THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, B.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. X MARCH, 1925 No. 57

EDITORIAL

By the death of Baron von Hügel English theology has lost one who held a unique place in contemporary thought. The present writer has vivid recollections of a walk he had with the Baron and Father Tyrrell in Kensington Gardens over fifteen years ago, at a time when the Modernist controversy was at its height in the Roman Communion; and he remembers the contrast between the excitable Irishman, full of plots and counterplots then hatching in Italy, and his older, more detached, friend who spoke with the patience born of infinite humour. Perhaps the greatest of all Baron von Hügel's services to Christianity was his massive and superabundant vindication of the supernatural as the ground of all true and durable religion, and of Catholicism as its inevitable expression. His work thus cut right across the dominant assumptions of the Edwardine age, with its blind belief in the divine impetus of natural progress; and his *Essays and Addresses*, which appeared late in 1921, was a kind of funeral oration over a philosophy which the war had laid in ruins. But it was more than that: for it showed beyond the ruins, standing full square, the imposing edifice of the City whose maker and builder is God; and in its many mansions Catholic thought, Anglican as well as Roman, has found a rich abundance of strength and peace. R.I.P.

We shall hope to publish an appreciation of the Baron's contribution to theology at an early date.

THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES

This year is the 1,600th since the Council of Nicæa and the great Creed which that Council produced. We who live in the West are apt to forget that in the critical days of early Christianity the centre of gravity of Church life was in the East, not with us, and that during the long and all-important period when the Creed of Christendom was being formed it was in the East that the chief work was done. The Western part of the Church made a certain contribution direct and indirect to the final result; but the forces that shaped the issue were in the main not Western. As the principal heresies, or misleading statements about great matters of faith, were chiefly Eastern, so was the refutation of them; and therefore, apart altogether from political causes, it was as obvious and natural to summon an Œcumenical Council to meet in the East as it would now be not to do so.

But though the centre of gravity has thus moved westward, Eastern Christianity is neither dead nor a negligible factor in Christendom. After being for centuries "fast bound in misery and iron," it has emerged into freedom and opportunity, and is intensely desirous to make full use of these new conditions. It is proposing to celebrate the sixteenth centenary of the Great Council by a solemn meeting of all its branches. It cannot, alas! meet at Nicæa, for that place and its church were not long ago destroyed by the Turks; and there would be grave difficulties in meeting anywhere on Turkish soil. Jerusalem is spoken of and Mount Athos, and of these two places the latter is the more central, and could solve the problem of accommodating large numbers without any difficulty and at the minimum of cost. So, too, the time of year is not fixed; it may be spring or autumn, the later date being more likely and wise. But this Council of the various sections of Orthodoxy will in all probability meet, because after something like twelve centuries without a great Council there is much to put right and to adjust. Some big questions of discipline, organization, and internal order are very urgently demanding solution. But as at home in England, so here are to be found those who are averse to all change, and those who ardently desire to see what they regard as improvements brought in and blemishes removed; and after so great a lapse of time without a Council it is not easy to predict which of these two kinds of mind will sway the assembly. And this makes the Council if it meets a very critical matter, directly for Orthodoxy, and indirectly for Christendom in general. For it is

as certain as anything can be that if the Council meets and breaks up, leaving things more or less unchanged, other forces not favourable to Orthodoxy will begin to exercise a disruptive influence to which no very strong resistance may be possible. And in the same way, if either ultra-conservative elements within Orthodox circles, or political enemies without, should succeed in preventing a Council from meeting, a hardly less dangerous condition will arise. It is therefore time that as many English people as possible who care about religion and can think of Christendom and the hopes and fears for Christianity as a whole, should understand something about Orthodoxy; what these Churches are and what they stand for. There are, of course, already many of our leaders in England who are real experts. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Bishop Gore, the Dean of Canterbury, Canon Douglas, Mr. Athelstan Riley, to mention a very few, lead an ever-widening circle of those who know that this matter is one of interest and importance about which it behoves the thoughtful churchman to be instructed. But it would assist the Church of England in very many ways, both as to some of our own internal problems, and in the fulfilment of our duty to the Church at large, if more knowledge were far more widely spread among us, and it is in this belief that these articles are appearing in THEOLOGY.

And to begin with let us try to see clearly what the phrase "Orthodox Christianity" or "the Orthodox Churches" means.

It denotes not one Church, but a number of autocephalous Churches which are, roughly speaking, also national Churches. There is the Greek Church for Greece, the Serbian for Serbia, the Roumanian and the Bulgarian and the Russian. But there are also autocephalous Patriarchates of Orthodox Christians in Moslem countries, such as those of Constantinople, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Cyprus. They are united by no common language or national tradition and culture; for they include Slavs, Greeks, Roumanians, and not a few whose speech is Turkish or Arabic, etc. But they have in common certain negatives, in that all alike have strenuously withstood the Turk for centuries, and that their very existence depends on the rejection of the position of the Vatican.

But these are only negatives. They have also positive influences which draw them together. In doctrine and discipline they are entirely united. They look back to the same "Fathers," and drink from the same sources. In liturgy and ritual and type of service they keep close to a common tradition. And in addition to these ties they all look to the Œcumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople as their historic centre. It is

not at all easy to define or describe accurately the nature of the primacy of this Patriarchate in Orthodox Christianity. If on one side it is hard not to exaggerate its force and importance, on the other hand it is not hard to make it seem of less moment and value than it actually is. The Constantinople Patriarch is no Pope. He has not even the amount of power granted to the M.C.C. in the cricket world. One might hope to find a closer parallel in the status of the See of Canterbury in the Anglican communion, *vis-à-vis* its self-governing daughters in the United States, Australia, South Africa, and elsewhere. But the character of the Anglican communion and the influences which have made it what it is differ so widely from those of the Orthodox world that this suggestion might be more misleading than instructive. Nebulous, intangible, uncertain, indefinable as its primacy is, the Œcumenical Patriarchate has so great, so pervasive, so subtle an importance, that though one hesitates to use such words as vital or essential, they would be nearer the fact than if one were to treat the place of Constantinople as of small moment because one cannot define or describe it closely.

Here, then, in bare outline, is what one means by the Orthodox Churches of the East. And at first sight it seems as if we were contemplating a homogeneous well-knit body, which for that very reason must have a great inherent force. A section of Christendom recognizing in some true fashion a common centre, united in faith and discipline and tradition, inhabiting without serious break a very large continuous territory, and now at length set free from Moslem control, must be a potent section of Christianity. But to speak the truth frankly, there are elements in the position which work in the opposite direction. The very close identification of Church and nation has given political issues an influence in ecclesiastical and religious matters which an Englishman finds it hard to realize. And the plots and counterplots of the Near East in the present century alone have had a deplorable reaction on Orthodox Christianity. Orthodox Russia is for the moment a force of small importance. But no well-informed person needs to be told in what mutual relations Greek and Bulgar and Roumanian and Serb stand to one another. If these actions and reactions were confined to political issues they would be deplorable enough. But a very little knowledge of the immediate past, or even the word "Macedonia" in the present, proves that they extend with all their stark ruthlessness into the sphere of religion and the Church. And perhaps at this point we can see one more very strong reason for emphasizing the importance of the proposed Pan-Orthodox Council. No one studying recent Balkan history can help being reminded of the early stages of our own development

in what we used to call Saxon England. There is the same series of rapidly changing alliances as quickly dissolved as formed, and of national policies dominated now by enmity, now perhaps by cupidity, but always responsive to a deeply rooted fear.

We find the same conviction that a strong and prosperous neighbour is a close and imminent danger. And the result is a restless diplomacy and a tendency to be absorbed in trying to find not a settled policy, but some astute expedient for meeting a danger which is at bottom itself quite as much a result of fear as a cause of it. Now there is no fact in English history more clear than that after only a few meetings of the first Pan-English Church Councils, these fears and enmities gave way to a permanently united England. True it is that we were helped enormously by being an island, and we had no near and powerful neighbours who believed that their best interests were served by fomenting disunion and keeping quarrels alive. But in the old days of "the Heptarchy" (as we are strictly and properly forbidden to call it), there were no doubt plenty of "agents provocateurs" in Wessex and Mercia and Northumbria, though there were no Press and no financial groups for the Church to counteract. And now in the Near East it would seem to be the best chance for peace that the Churches of this the most dangerous storm-centre of the world should meet as a unit, if not yet a complete unity, and by realizing in Council all the precious and vital matters and interests that they have in common should lead the way to a new era of fellowship and mutual understanding and trust. Statesmen and diplomats have failed; let the spiritual forces have freer chance to see what they can achieve. Altogether apart from religion the project is one which ought to have the support of every statesman and organization and individual who truly desires peace, and particularly should it find an active and intelligent public opinion in England in its favour. The idea is one which for its realization may well need very strong support, for in more than one influential quarter this plan of Pan-Orthodox Council will be regarded with suspicion and disfavour.

There is also another matter, the present condition of which threatens the strength and well-being of Orthodoxy. I am alluding to the position of the Œcumenical Patriarchate itself. If my attempt to express without defining the importance of this institution to the whole of Orthodox Christianity has been at all successful, it will be at once seen that if it could be abolished, a very serious and probably a mortal wound would be inflicted. And the surest way of extinguishing it would be to see that it became so feeble and functioned so badly that no one would desire or could defend its continued existence. And that the

Patriarchate seems to be getting dangerously close to this condition is hardly a matter of doubt. But I will deal with this issue in my second article.

JOHN GIBRALTAR.

THE WASHING OF THE FEET: A NEW INTERPRETATION

(St. John xiii. 1-17)

THE remarkable incident at the Last Supper of our Lord washing the feet of His disciples is usually regarded as being simply an object lesson in Christian humility. In St. John's record, however, seem to be several indications of a significance very much vaster and much nearer the heart of the Passion.

The Evangelist leads up to the incident with a statement of most profound solemnity, in which he describes it as an act of our Lord's uttermost love. His statement, moreover, implies quite unmistakably that the scene had directly to do with the treachery of Judas on the one hand, and with our Lord's entrance into His Kingdom on the other. Again, though St. Peter obviously grasped and was overwhelmed by the external humility of His action, yet the Lord Himself declared its true meaning to lie far beyond the devoted disciple's present understanding. Lastly, when presently He challenged His followers to imitate His example, He spoke with an intensity of appeal that is unique in the Gospel record, for which no call for service, however lowly, can adequately account.

These indications lead strongly to the surmise that the true significance of the scene was of a far more momentous character than the common explanation allows for. The writer ventures to make suggestion of another interpretation, more in accord with the whole tremendous drama of the Life in St. John's prophetic presentation of it.

For St. John (to use the traditional name, without begging the question of authorship) writes, not as a mere chronicler of events, but as a prophet—one to whom the will of God is the key of human history. In his eyes the wonder of the historic Life is the final unfolding and perfect fulfilment in the Christ of God's eternal will and purpose of love towards the whole world. And the avowed object of his book is so to uplift the Christ before men that, coming to see Him as He eternally is in Himself, and the place He holds in the universe of God, they may believe and find life in His name. In short, his theme is

the essential glory of our Lord—all that He stands for in human life. With this end in view it can be confidently assumed that the Evangelist would have left the story of the Washing of the Feet aside, had he not perceived in it something much greater than a passing lesson in Christian morals.

To come to the record. It is frequently St. John's manner to pave the way for his readers' understanding of a scene of the Life that he is about to describe by first setting before them its vital spiritual background. Obvious instances may be seen in his opening reference to our Lord's unfailing knowledge of men in the story of Nicodemus, or to the nearness of the Passover in his narrative of the miracle of the Feeding. The Evangelist intends his readers thereby to perceive that our Lord's insight into human character on the former occasion, and the people's excitement about the Passover on the latter, were cardinal factors in what followed, apart from which the Lord's great teaching on the New Birth and on the Bread of Life cannot be fully apprehended.

Now in just the same way does St. John put before us the spiritual background of the Washing of the Feet in the words, "During supper, the devil having already put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him, Jesus, knowing that the Father had put all things into his hands, and that he cometh from God, and goeth unto God, riseth from supper." The point is that St. John is not here simply recalling the solemn atmosphere of the moment, still less is he giving us a mere note of time. His profound statement means nothing less than that these two circumstances—namely, that Judas, on the one hand, in will and intention was now become the traitor, and, on the other, that the Lord Himself had already entered into His glory, for in spirit the final sacrifice was already offered—were governing causes of His action in the scene that followed. In other words, when the Master washed the feet of His disciples, He was putting forth the whole redeeming love and power of His Cross, and He was putting it forth in some manner in relation to His fallen Apostle. Thus St. John prepares us to find in the incident a very vital step in the drama of the Passion.

The Evangelist proceeds to describe the Lord's action—how He girded Himself and poured water into the basin and began to wash the disciples' feet and to wipe them with the towel wherewith He was girded.

Now St. John, more perhaps than any other Apostolic writer, compels us to see how profoundly the mind of our Lord was steeped in the Old Testament. Again and again, to understand his book, we have to turn to the writings of the prophets. And if here we look to the prophets for some light on the Washing

of the Feet, the answer is hardly doubtful. The Lord's action was obviously symbolic, and its highly remarkable character renders virtually certain that it was, in fact, of the nature of a prophetic sign, to be compared, for instance, to Isaiah's walking barefoot in the streets of Jerusalem. Two such non-miraculous, definitely prophetic signs the Lord had already enacted in the Cleansing of the Temple and the Royal Entry. Now in the hour of His final self-revelation to the world He performs another no less far-reaching in its significance.

Considered, then, as a prophetic sign, what was the meaning and purpose of our Lord's action? Two facts seem to give us the clue.

In the first place, our Lord had come up to the Holy City to enter on His Kingdom. Sayings of the Galilean days put beyond doubt His expectation that His ministry on earth would culminate in the coming of the Kingdom of God at His death. "Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come." "There be some of them that stand here, which shall in no wise taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in His kingdom." Round the fulfilment of this expectation St. John, with deep prophetic insight, gathers up his whole narrative of the Passion.

His very significant account of the Supper at Bethany, with little question, means that the Lord Himself regarded Mary's act of devotion as being His own anointing as King of the Kingdom of God through His sacrificial death. (And it may be added that herein lies, surely, the true explanation of His remarkable prophecy that Mary's act would be told wherever the Gospel was preached; for it was, in fact, the first step in His entrance into His glory.) So, as now become King of the Kingdom, the Lord accordingly made His royal entry into the Holy City on the next day. From this point, keeping close to the main thread of the drama, St. John passes directly to the coming of the Greeks. For in their desire to see Him—representatives of the vast heathen world—the Lord recognized the signal for the final sacrifice by which His universal Kingdom was to be established. There in the Temple He accepts the summons: "Father, glorify Thy name." And at once He claims His Kingdom: "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Myself." From this moment onwards He acts and speaks as King of the Kingdom in the plenitude of power.

The point is, that all through the Last Supper, and not least as He washed the feet of the Twelve, the Lord was acting as King of the Kingdom of God. It was indeed His first act

on entering into His glory. In fine, the Washing of the Feet was an act not of humility, but of kingly love and power. As such, what did it signify ?

Here comes into the story a second fact. We are all familiar with our Lord's use in His teaching of the traditional Jewish figure of the Messianic banquet or marriage feast as a picturesque description of the Kingdom of God. Underlying the figure was, of course, the old idea that to eat at the royal table was a notable mark of the king's love and favour, as we may see in David's invitation to Barzillai and Mephibosheth.

Now at least once in His teaching on the Kingdom our Lord carried the figure a stage further: " Blessed are those servants whom the Lord, when He cometh, shall find watching. Verily, I say unto you, He shall gird Himself, and shall make them sit down to meat, and shall come and serve them." The application of this extended figure to our Lord's own action now in the Supper-room seems irresistible. It throws a flood of light on His action considered as a prophetic sign.

What we learn is this. By His own willing acceptance of the call to the final Sacrifice, the Lord had entered into His Kingdom. And by the Eucharist He had now made His disciples sharers in the Sacrifice, and all its spiritual fruit and power. (For that the Institution had already taken place before the Washing of the Feet began is rendered almost certain by two considerations: in the first place, all St. John's narrative from this point onwards, right up to the departure of the band from the Supper-room, forms an unbroken, closely connected chain of events in which there is no room at all for the Institution; in the second place, immediately after the present incident the Lord sent forth Judas on his awful errand, and it would be profoundly contrary to the whole principle of our Lord's treatment of the traitor and the whole teaching of this Gospel on the judgment of Christ to suppose that Judas was thereby excluded from the Eucharist.)

Now came the Washing of the Feet. Its significance seems unmistakable. Acting as King of the Kingdom of God, the Lord renders to His own the symbolic kingly service of extremest love and favour—the token of their complete spiritual union with Him in His glory, and of the fulfilment here and now of His great promise: " Where I am, there also shall My servant be."

Thus the Washing of the Feet was an expression of profoundest love. So St. John himself describes it in the opening words of the record: " Having loved His own which were in the world, He loved them to the uttermost " (R.V. marg.). No words could be stronger. And it is in the light of the intense love symbolized

by the prophetic sign that the Lord's tremendous purpose in enacting it becomes manifest. This purpose—the heart of the whole matter—His own words in the teaching to St. Peter disclose to us.

Guiding Peter's thoughts step by step to a true apprehension of His purpose, the Lord answered His disciple's passionate protest by the declaration: "What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt understand hereafter." In the same way does St. John's record show how, of the earlier prophetic signs also —the Cleansing of the Temple and the Royal Entry—the disciples at the time understood almost nothing, and that only in the light of the Resurrection and of the illumination of the Spirit of love at Pentecost did they come to grasp their intense significance. So it was to be, the Lord implies, with the Washing of the Feet. In other words, the sign was nothing less than a part of the eternal Gospel by which the world was to be redeemed.

Next, in face of Peter's bewildered persistence, the Master disclosed the spiritual reality underlying His action. "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with Me." Old Testament usage makes plain the meaning of the latter part of the saying to be "no part and lot with Me in My kingdom." And that renders clear also the significance of the former part: by no works or righteousness of his own could Peter, or any other, enter the Kingdom of God, but only through the cleansing power of the blood of Christ. Obviously the saying was a quite general statement, and the Lord's next words unveil the special application of it to which He was leading Peter's thoughts. But, taken as a general statement, it implies the glorious truth that our Lord is forever washing the feet of His disciples. That is to say, He is always at work, girded to render to His own in the Kingdom the kingly service of intensest love by taking into His own powerful hands their personal sanctification. So to a Christian the consciousness of growing holiness is the supremest proof of Christ's love. It is by far his surest ground of confidence and assurance that he is with our Lord in glory. For he is thus being "washed" by Christ, and is becoming morally and spiritually like Him, apart from which likeness none can have part and lot with Him in His Kingdom.

Grasping now at least something of the love of the Master's action, Peter cried, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head." This was met by the arresting answer, "He that is bathed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit: and ye are clean, but not all. For," adds the Evangelist, "He knew him that should betray Him; therefore said he, Ye are not all clean."

Our Lord was here using that proverbial language that He often employed to challenge His hearers to think for themselves. What was it that He wished Peter to take into account and to think out the significance of for himself? His own words, "Ye are clean, but not all," make plain, and St. John's comment on the words renders doubly sure that what He intended Peter to consider was the relation of what He had done—His act of profoundest love—towards the traitor.

And the application of the proverbial language He had used seems clear. By the term "bathed" He was referring, indirectly at least, to John's baptism—that rite which the Forerunner demanded from all his followers in token of their break from the past and complete change of life, in preparation for the coming of the Messiah and the baptism of the Spirit. In this sense the faithful Eleven were certainly bathed men, whether baptised of John or not. Hence, because they were thus converted and changed, the Lord's sacramental act of cleansing had rendered them every whit clean in the sight of God.

Yet there was one of the band who was all unbathed and unconverted, false and foul within—the traitor Judas. This was the whole point.

For the Lord had made no difference. He washed the feet of all alike—of Judas as of the rest (as St. John's record makes abundantly clear). Knowing that Judas was in will and intention become the traitor, even now at the last, He refused to judge him. He did more. He rendered to him the same kingly service—the same act of boundless love—as to Peter or John. He offered a place at His side in His Kingdom to the false friend who was bringing Him to the Cross. In short, He loved His enemy, and that with the love that forgives until seventy times seven.

We can, then, gather up now the whole tremendous significance of the scene.

Let us recall once again St. John's own all-significant description of it, "Having loved His own which were in the world, He loved them to the uttermost." Now in the Fourth Gospel (not to say in our Lord's teaching always) the word "love," like the word "judge," connotes action, not simply inward attitude and principle. Just as the Lord's saying, "I judge no man," means, not that our Lord refrained from condemning sin, but that He refused to quench the smoking flax by action, and cast the sinner out of the fold (for example, though He would not judge Judas, with intense sternness He described him as a devil); so does the word "loved," which St. John here uses, signify that the Lord in this scene began to carry His uttermost love into energetic action.

"Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; that ye may be sons of your Father which is in heaven; for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust." Thus, in that first Gospel of the Kingdom which we call the Sermon on the Mount, the Lord had described the divine love—the love like God's own—which is the very breath of the life of the Kingdom. Can we doubt that here He was, to use St. John's phrase, "doing the truth" of the Kingdom? He was living out the life of the Kingdom in its utmost reality. And by thus doing it He was creating it.

Though it carries us beyond the present scene, let us remember how, in the Sermon on the Mount, the Lord had coupled with the principle of love towards enemies that other principle of non-resistance to evil. "Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever smiteth thee on the one cheek, turn to him the other also." It seems certain that in the next incident in the Supper-room the Lord was "doing the truth" of this principle also. To regard the sending forth of Judas as an act of judgment, as is sometimes done, is clean contrary to the whole teaching of the Fourth Gospel on the judgment of Christ. "What thou doest, do quickly." The Lord was referring to the compact of Judas with the Jewish Rulers. He was voluntarily giving Himself over into the traitor's power—by His own act making the Cross certain and consummating His life of perfect obedience to the Father's loving will.

Thus, by a double act of perfect love to His enemy and refusal to resist evil, our Lord took the first decisive steps in the Sacrifice of reconciliation. The moment was the spiritual crisis of His Passion. And St. John's narrative makes clear that He Himself so viewed it: "When Judas was gone out Jesus saith, Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in Him." That is to say, by what He had just done, His own work as Saviour of mankind, and in it the Father's purpose of love towards all His children was begun to be accomplished. The Kingdom of God was in being, and the world's redemption was certain.

As to what followed when the Lord sat down again after the Washing of the Feet, we must recollect that the Eleven had as yet no thought or suspicion at all of the treachery of their fellow Apostle. So the Lord could only speak in veiled terms. He offers no explanation of the prophetic sign. As His first words to Peter imply, He was content that the scene was imprinted on their memories, to spring up into intense meaning in days to come. Only His words give the vivid impression, not only that He was profoundly conscious of making a supreme demand on the obedience of His followers, but that what He

had done had been very hard even to Himself to do. Certainly, no appeal for lowly service in itself can explain His language.

But if the Washing of the Feet had the profound significance that the writer has attempted to describe, the reason of the intensity of the Lord's appeal is not far to seek. The appeal was unique because the challenge was supreme. We know, especially from His greatest parables, such as the Prodigal Son and the Rich Man and Lazarus, that it was always our Lord's teaching that the worst barrier in the path of the Kingdom in that generation was the antipathy and contempt of God's historic Church for the Gentiles; just as to-day the chief obstacle to the Gospel is the traditional divisions of class and race in the modern world. The Lord's remedy for the world was not merely to make things better, but to make them altogether new. Only the Kingdom of God, lived out to its height, could break down the walls of partition, and create the brotherhood of mankind. For the Kingdom of God, as appears in the Master's later teaching in the Supper-room, is a common life—in the big, free world of God's love—and with the Spirit of divine love at work in the hearts of men. So Christ's heralds, going forth to build up His Kingdom in the world, were ever to remember that the first act of the King on His entrance into His glory was to love His enemy with the perfect love of forgiveness until seventy times seven; as His first word in death was to say, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

R. A. Henderson.

CONFESSION TO LAYMEN.—II.

In a former article I sketched very briefly the history of the official penitential system of the Church down to 1215, and then, by way of contrast, translated the relevant passages of Simeon the New Theologian's treatise on Confession, which reflects the standpoint of the Church of Constantinople about the year 1000. No purpose is served by trying to treat as one and the same institution the official excommunication and reconciliation of notorious sinners at the hands of the bishop, and the custom by which scrupulous souls sought the ministrations of holy men whether lay or cleric. Though the two streams are united in the modern Sacrament of Penance, in origin they are distinct. Certainly the latter is not a perverted type of the former. Let us now study its beginnings and history.

I

That informal confession, referred to in St. James' " Confess your sins one to another," existed from the first, may be safely assumed; also that confession was normally made to those best qualified to deal with souls. But for our purpose it is sufficient to start with Clement of Alexandria. All the essentials of the later monk, the spiritual father or " man of God " who heard confessions, are found in Clement's picture of the Gnostic. " He who has first moderated his passions and trained himself for impassivity, and developed to the beneficence of gnostic perfection, is here equal to the angels " (*Strom.*, vi. 13). Impassivity (ἀπάθεια) is a technical term in Greek monasticism; so is " angelic life." " Those who have exercised themselves in the Lord's commandments, and lived perfectly and gnostically according to the gospel, may be enrolled in the perfect body of the apostles. Such an one is in reality a presbyter of the Church, and a true minister (deacon) of the will of God, if he do and teach what is the Lord's; not as being ordained by men, nor regarded righteous because a presbyter, but enrolled in the presbyterate because righteous " (*ibid.*). We have been advised recently to give the phrase " charismatic ministry " a rest, but rightly understood it would be useful to describe what is in Clement's mind. The monks of Egypt were conscious athletes, striving for the mastery and to break records in the conflicts of asceticism: " This [the Gnostic] is the true athlete—he who . . . is crowned for the true victory over all the passions " (*Strom.*, vii. 3). The Gnostic is " the friend of God " (another technical monastic word). " Request for the conversion of our neighbours is the function of the Gnostic." His prayers are granted (vii. 7). In vii. 11 we have Clement's opinion of those who, in foolhardy fashion, rush into martyrdom. " No one who is irrationally brave is a Gnostic," he says, and proceeds to show that the Gnostic, willing to suffer, but not pushing himself forward, is the true martyr. The association of ideas by which the monk succeeded the martyr is perfectly clear. The Gnostic is in all essentials the later monk: the Gnostic is also the true martyr: the monk also is the martyr. The following passage (vii. 13) illustrates the pastoral activity of the Gnostic: " Praying that he may get a share in the sins of his brethren, with a view to confession and conversion on the part of his kindred."

Origen taught that he who would forgive sins must be spiritual himself, having received the Spirit like the apostles; only such a one can heal according to the mind of God (*de Orat.*, 28). The power of binding and loosing varies in proportion to

the spiritual gifts of him who exercises it.* "The gates . . . of hell must not control him who wishes to bind and loose; but if he is bound with the cords of his sins, in vain he both binds and looses" (*In Matt.*, tom. xii., ch. xiv.). In the second homily on Leviticus, chapter iv., Origen refers to a sinner's disclosing his sin to "a priest of the Lord," and seeking medicine. But in the second homily on Psalm xxxvii., he bids the sinner seek out a soul doctor with care and testing.† The qualifications which he enumerates are personal, and not official. It would seem that the choice is theoretically from the whole body of Christians, but for practical purposes there was as yet no body of men other than priests whose help one would be likely to seek, so that in the passage quoted above the recipient of confessions is called a priest.

II

The Epistle of the Church of Vienne and Lyons, preserved by Eusebius,‡ vividly illustrates the estimation in which the martyrs were held in the last part of the second century. The martyrs were athletes, contending in the lists against the devil. In them the sufferings of Christ, mystically united with His Church, were renewed. "Christ, suffering in him [Sanctus], manifested His glory, delivering him from his adversary." Of Pothinus it is said: "Though his body was worn out by old age and disease, his life was preserved that Christ might triumph in it. When he was brought by the soldiers to the tribunal, accompanied by the civil magistrates and a multitude who shouted against him in every manner as if he were Christ Himself, he bore noble witness." Requests made to a martyr shortly before his death had every chance of being granted. Would he not be admitted into the immediate presence of his King? and would anything be denied to the faithful servant? So a martyr's assistance was sought by those who were disheartened by the rigour of the official system. But martyr meant one who had been tormented for the faith, whether fatally or not, and the extension of his prerogatives to the confessor was easy and natural. The extraordinary claims of the confessors in the times of Cyprian to wield the disciplinary powers of the Church are too well known to need description. Probably the mystical identification of the martyrs with the suffering Christ was the most potent element in the growth of their prestige.

* ὅσῳ οὖν βελτίων ὁ δεσμεύων, τοσοῦτον μακαριώτατος ὁ λελυμένος. (*In Matt.*, tom. xiii., chap. 31.)

† Tantummodo circumspice diligentius, cui debeas confiteri peccatum tuum. Proba prius medicum. . . . Multa hoc deliberatione et satis perito medici illius consilio procurandum est.

‡ *H. E.*, v. 1.

In the Apostolic Constitutions we read: " A confessor is not ordained; for he is so by choice and patience, and is worthy of great honour, as having confessed the name of God, and of His Christ, before nations and Kings " (viii. 23). The Constitutions are an ideal reconstruction, but must have been sufficiently true to the customs of the third and fourth century to render their attribution to the apostles plausible; that contemporary practice was loyal to apostolic tradition no one would have doubted.

Broadly speaking, after 252 the powers of the martyrs and confessors in the West were shattered, but for a considerable time honour was paid to them. In the East the ascetic development of the fourth century overshadowed all else, and the monks became heirs to the positions occupied by the martyrs, Clement's Gnostic and Origen's spiritual physician. An interesting passage in Athanasius' *Life of Antony* reflects the change in ideas. During the persecution of 303-311 Antony went to Alexandria. " And he longed to suffer martyrdom, but not being willing to give himself up, he ministered to the confessors in the mines and in the prisons. . . . He prayed to be a martyr, wherefore he seemed as one grieved that he had not borne his witness. . . . When at last the persecution ceased . . . Antony departed, and again withdrew to his cell, and was there daily a martyr to his conscience, and contending in the conflicts of faith " (46, 47). We seem to hear Athanasius saying, " Behold the martyr of these days." The arena in which these martyrs contended is described by Cassian: Antony's " followers are rightly termed anchorites, that is, withdrawers, because, being by no means satisfied with that victory whereby they had trodden under foot the hidden snares of the devil, while still living among men, they were eager to fight with the devils in open conflict and a straightforward battle, and so feared not to penetrate the vast recesses of the desert " (*Coll.*, xviii. 6).

III

The vague ideas of the age were summed up in the personality of St. Antony, which in its turn was a model for further developments. St. Augustine, for example, was " amazed to hear that so lately, and almost in our own days, such wonderful things had been wrought by Thee " (*Conf.*, viii. 6). Countless Christians modelled their conduct on that of Antony. Not only was he visited in the desert by those who wanted spiritual help, but he himself set the example of " zealous amendment of the whole life," and awoke in many a tender conscience scruples which could only be stilled by confession. His instructions to

the monks who sought his guidance are very modern in tone. Systematic self-examination is enjoined, with special reference to the discipline of thoughts. The keeping of a spiritual diary is actually recommended. "As a safeguard against sin let the following be observed. Let us each one note and write down our actions and the impulses of our soul as though we were going to relate them to each other" (55).

IV

St. Basil's works are indispensable to the student of fourth-century confession. On the one hand, he was called upon as bishop to administer the official Church system in the highly developed form which prevailed in Asia Minor, whereby the period of penance varied according to the offence; see the "*Canonical*" *Epistles to Amphilochius* (188, 199, 217). On the other hand, he made confession as a means of grace a regular practice in his monasteries. The two things are quite distinct, and there is no sign of his having brought them into connection one with the other.

We must recall the traditional classification of sins: (i.) sins unto death—*i.e.*, idolatry, impurity, and murder, which, in early times, were left to the mercy of God, but were brought within the scope of reconciliation, at least in the West, after the Novatianist schism of 252; (ii.) ordinary serious sins, which were the subject of confession; (iii.) venial sins, which seem to have been practically ignored by the rank and file in the third century. Now Basil's treatise, *On the Judgment of God*, which to a hasty reading merely enunciates platitudes, becomes a document of great importance when we reconstruct its background. It is largely autobiographical. Basil describes his upbringing amid conventional ideas. Then, on his reaching man's estate, the scales fell from his eyes. He realized that God's inexorable judgment is pronounced upon all sins, however small they may seem to us, and that omission is equivalent to commission. At the same time God's mercy is boundless.* By this simplification he extended the subject-matter of confession in both directions, by including both sins unto death and venial offences. When we remember that Basil became the spiritual father of unnumbered thousands during his own and the following generations, we see the importance of his discovery. The great spiritual experience to which he refers in *On the Judgment of God*, a period of darkness followed by illumination, can be none other than his conversion, which took place soon after he returned to Cæsarea from Athens in 356. His first step was to visit

* *De Iudicio* and Shorter Rules, 4, 13, 15.

Egypt, the fountain head of Monasticism, and see the holy men of that country for himself. During this period, which coincided approximately with the year 357, he came into close contact with the ideas preserved to us in the *Life of Antony*. We suspect that the teaching of Origen, if not already familiar to him, became so at this time. The suspicion becomes a certainty when we find Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus making a selection of passages from Origen (the *Philocalia*) shortly after Basil's return home.

Basil's Longer and Shorter Rules inculcate systematic and frequent confession as a necessary part of the common life. If the implications of a life lived together are followed up, everything, including the hidden things of the heart, must be shared with one's fellows. Confession is to be made to the Superior, or to one of a class of Superiors or seniors within the monastery.* In one passage only is there any suggestion that a priest is to hear confessions. In the 288th Shorter Rule "those who are entrusted with the administration of the mysteries of God" are mentioned. But an informal reference to 1 Cor. iv. 1 must not be pressed. Besides, Basil proceeds to refer to John the Baptist† as one of those so entrusted, and the Baptist was the typical ascetic and desert-dweller, not a priest.‡

V

The combination in Basil of monk and bishop is of great significance. To this day bishops in the Eastern Church are chosen from the ranks of the monks, not from the married parish priests. From the days of Basil onwards, Greek monasticism was brought into the service of the Church. Not that any anti-hierarchical tendencies are to be detected before his date. Early monasticism was a lay movement, but the monks were always loyal in principle to ecclesiastical organization; they honoured the priesthood, but avoided it as an exercise in humility.

We have said enough to show how natural it was for the laity to open their griefs to those of the monks who had spiritual gifts

* These are called either προεστῶτες or πρεσβύτεροι, and are monks who possess the necessary charisma. πρεσβύτεροι cannot=priests, for (i.) when Basil speaks of a priest in the monastery he uses ἱερεύς, (ii.) a sister confesses to a πρεσβύτερος in the presence of a πρεσβυτέρα. The πρεσβύτερος, therefore, was one who had a counterpart in the sisterhood, and must be translated "senior."

† *Cf.* the occurrence of John the Baptist in the modern *Confiteor*.

‡ See my *St. Basil the Great* (1913) for a treatment of this subject. Various Roman Catholic reviewers said, Yes, *confession* may have been made to those who were not priests, but *absolution* was not given. The criticism is beside the mark, for no *Ego absoluo te* is known before the thirteenth century. In the fully developed theory of confession taught by Simeon the New Theologian, the monk—whether priest or layman—has the power of binding and loosing.

and were able, like wise physicians, to cure the diseases of souls. Basil's instructions are designed for the monks, but he frequently refers to visitors who came for edification. Further, he set up his cenobia in the towns, so that the spread of confession to the laity outside the monasteries needs no explanation. But why did the East develop so differently from the West? and how did the Eastern monks come to claim *exclusive* privileges during the period 900-1200? The following considerations, though not a complete answer to these questions, will remove some of the perplexity which arises in the mind of the English reader.

1. Monasticism originated in the East, where it was the heir to many of the spiritual ideals of the second and third centuries. In the West it was an importation, and hardly native to the soil until it had been refashioned by St. Benedict. But St. Benedict was a thorough Roman, and naturally impressed a Roman stamp upon the movement. To him, as to others of his mental presuppositions, much that was natural in the East would have seemed sheer lawlessness. But in Celtic monasticism, the exponents of which were far removed from Rome mentally as well as geographically, Eastern features reappeared. It is tempting to try to trace their connection with the East through Latin translations of Eastern rules, or perhaps through the Rhone valley with its Greek traditions. But the common features are probably the natural expression of the ideas of asceticism, where they have not been modified by the Roman genius.

2. East and West differ in their conception of the Spirit. The East rejects the *Filioque*, but insists on the Epiclesis in the Eucharist. So as regards confession, The West regards the Spirit as a gift bestowed upon the Church once and for all in the days of the apostles, which is now dispensed through the proper channels of grace. Who but priests, then, should hear confessions and convey the assurance of pardon? The Greeks, thinking of the Holy Ghost as descending upon the elements at each celebration of the Eucharist, and to be invoked afresh on each occasion, sought out πνευματόφοροι, men unmistakably filled with the Holy Ghost, when they needed spiritual help. And according to the ideas of their day, the monks, in whom alone the charismata of apostolic times were to be found, were such men as they required.

3. The theories of Dionysius the Areopagite had a great influence. He taught that the taking of the monastic habit was a sacrament or mystery. It was described as "second baptism." As baptism remitted sins for ordinary people, so becoming a monk gave entry into a higher life (βίος ἀγγελικός) of perfect

penitence. Clearly, then, a monk was the most suitable man to deal with problems of sin and its remission, seeing that he was the ideal penitent.

4. The special favour in which the monks were regarded during the period 900-1200 is in part to be explained by their attitude towards the Iconoclastic controversy. The secular priesthood was largely on the side of the persecuting emperors, the monks took the opposite side. With the triumph of the icons the monks came into popular favour. The original idea that they had succeeded to the prerogatives of the martyrs was reinforced by their brave endurance of persecutions during the ninth century.

5. Perhaps the most potent cause of all is the simple fact that secular priests in the East were married, monks unmarried. Even in our own day practical difficulties arise in the minds of some regarding confession to married priests. In an age when no one had any doubt about the higher rank of the celibate, the secular priest must have seemed an unsuitable person to be a father-confessor.

The result of our investigation is this: There were two forms of penitence in the early Church—the official Church discipline, for which the bishop was responsible, a discipline reserved for serious offences and normally not exercised in the case of an individual more than once in a lifetime; and the seeking by tender consciences of a physician of the soul, who was in the East generally a monk, whether cleric or lay being immaterial. The modern Sacrament of Penance cannot be found in any recognizable form in primitive times. In so far as the bishop is ultimately responsible, his authority being normally exercised by the parish priest, the original official system, the restoration of which is referred to in the Commination Service of the Book of Common Prayer as much to be desired, may be said to persist. But for practical purposes confession to-day represents the healing of sick souls by a competent physician endued with the power of binding and loosing so carefully practised by the Greek monks. This state of affairs vividly illustrates the impossibility of returning to the primitive Church. In the course of centuries a far more workable method has been developed than any known to the early Church. But much can be learned from the Greeks. The English priest who takes upon himself to administer the official system must never forget that equipment of the Spirit and knowledge of a wise physician of souls, without which the Greek monk would not have dared to hear confessions. And he who aspires to train souls cannot afford to neglect the Greek ascetical and mystical writers, in particular

those who are most firmly based on the New Testament, and who made their contribution before Dionysius the Areopagite had troubled the stream.*

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

PARADISE

A recent controversy in the correspondence columns of a religious weekly makes it not inept to inquire seriously into the question, What did the Fathers mean by Paradise? Our present attempt is confined to the Greek Fathers, and is based upon material collected for the projected Lexicon of Patristic Greek (editor, the Principal of Pusey House, Oxford).

I

It may be prefaced that in the LXX the word *paradise* has two meanings, first a wooded park or pleasure-garden (*e.g.*, Isa. i. 30, Jer. xxix. 5, Sus. 4, etc.), and secondly, the garden of Eden. In the Old Testament pseudepigraphic apocalypses the word may refer to almost anything, and a brief study of the article "Paradise" in H.D.B., or use of the index to Dr. Charles' *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, will quickly reduce the inquirer to a proper state of bewilderment. In the main we may distinguish two broad senses: that of an idealized terrestrial Eden; and that of a celestial Eden which is the former's theological ground or ultimate transformation, and seems to be regarded sometimes as equivalent to heaven, sometimes as a temporary *refrigerium* for the righteous until the last day. But there is no consistency in the matter.

Of the three New Testament occurrences—viz., Luke xxiii. 43, Rev. ii. 7, 2 Cor. xii. 4—the two former indicate rest in the presence of God after earthly tribulation, the latter describes a mystical experience.

II

The sense of *paradise* in the Greek Fathers may be said to be conditioned throughout by two facts. In the first place, its associations are almost always more biblical than theological; and it is hardly ever employed without some consciousness that

* Cassian, whose *Conferences* are a repertory of the experience of the Egyptian monks, may be counted as a Greek for this purpose. Macarius' *Homilies* (translated by Canon Mason) are a rich mine of ascetical theology. *The Ascetic Works of St. Basil* (an English edition of which by me will appear this year) consist almost entirely of applications of Scripture to the problems of the spiritual life.

it is also found in the Book of Genesis. Even when it refers to future bliss, attention is constantly called to the fact that that bliss is one which mankind lost, in some sense, in Eden.

The second fact supplies the necessary corrective to the sweeping enunciation just made of the first fact: it is that right through the patristic period *paradise* is regularly and naturally used in its non-technical sense of a *pleasure-garden*. Thus Clement Alex. refers (*Strom.*, i. 7, xxxvii. 4) to "the operations employed in nurseries and *gardens* and orchards." Eusebius (*prep. ev.*, ix. 41, 457D) quotes a reference to the wooded amenities of the palace at Babylon, which had the name of "hanging-*gardens*." Gregory of Nyssa (*in Cant.*, ix., M. 44, 969B) states that "usage gives the name of *garden* to a grove planted and shaded with trees." Macarius Æg. (*hom.* xvi. 8) mentions "houses, *gardens*, and clothing" as the natural requirements of a man of substance.

Nilus (*epp.*, iii. 301) refers to the inconvenience occasioned to land-owners when the boundary-wall of their property is broken down: "while the fence stands the vineyard or *garden* is protected against hostile designs." In the *protevangelium of James* (ii. 4) St. Anne is sitting under a laurel tree "in the *garden*" (repeated by [Eust. Ant] *hex.*, M. 18, 772D, and Joh. Eub. *in conc. deip.*, xi., M. 96, 1476B). John Mosch. (*prat. spir.*, M. 87, 3097C) relates that "there are *gardens* in the centre of the city [Alexandria] in the houses of the magnates." Olympiodorus (*in Eccles.*, ii. 5, M. 93, 496B) defines that "κῆπος properly means land bearing vegetables, παράδεισος land planted with diverse trees"; while George Pis. (*vit. Anast.*, M. 92, 1692C) uses *paradise* of a monastic kitchen-garden, but only in order to make a play of words between this and "the *paradise* above."

III

Let us revert to Eden. *Paradise* continually denotes that "garden of delight" (ὁ παράδεισος τῆς τρυφῆς, *cf.* Gen. iii. 24, LXX) in passages far too numerous and too commonplace to be worth quoting. The delights sometimes illustrate that romantic side of the human approach to nature which the ancients as a rule so sedulously repressed or concealed. Thus Homer is accused by Justin Mart. [?] (*coh. ad Græc.*, xxviii.) of copying from *paradise* his account of the gardens of Alcinoüs (certain of the Fathers, with greater philosophical insight than historical accuracy, thought all good ideas had been acquired by the Greeks from Moses). The Christian interpolation in *apoc. Bar.*, iv., charmingly says that the Flood "penetrated into *paradise* and destroyed every flower"—a slight but in-

teresting touch. The *book of Aseneth.*, xvi., speaks of the "cedars of *paradise*" as ordinary persons refer to those of Lebanon, while in the same place peculiar excellence seems to be ascribed to the honey "made by the bees of *paradise* from the dew of the roses that are therein."

Less fanciful is the long and Avilion-like description of *paradise* in [Bas.] *hom. de parad.*, ii. *ff.* (Bas. i. 348A *ff.*), complete with every grace of flower and bird and climate. On the other hand, Philostorgius (*h. e.*, iii. 10 and 11) in his literalism treats of the subject in the tone of a land agent or of an Elizabethan profiteering adventurer.

Sometimes the story of *paradise* is treated as a mere allegory. The Valentinian Gnostics seized upon the name, *more suo*, and attached it to an æon or angel, whom they located in the fourth heaven (*Iren. hær.*, I. v. 2, *cf.* Clem. Al., *exc. Theod.*, li. 1). Simon Magus is reported (Hippol., *ref.* VI. xiv. 7) to have interpreted *paradise* in detail as meaning the womb; Clement Alex. (*Strom.*, v. 11, lxxii. 2) and Manes (*act. Arch.*, xi. 1=Epiph. *hær.*, lxvi. 29) inclined to interpret it as meaning the created universe.

IV

Normally, however, *paradise* was taken very literally. Irenæus and his "elders" place it outside the present world, and hover between treating it for eschatological purposes as an intermediate abode for the righteous, and as an abode of second-class bliss in perpetuity. "Where was the first man placed? In *paradise* . . . and from there he was cast out into this world after his trespass. . . . Those who were translated were translated thither; for *paradise* is prepared for men who are righteous and bear the Spirit . . . and there they remain until the consummation, enjoying a prelude to immortality" (*hær.*, V. v. 1). But at V. xxxvi. 1 we read, "There is this distinction of habitation between those who produce a hundredfold, and those who produce sixty- or thirtyfold; the first will be taken up into the heavens, the second will abide in *paradise*, the last will inhabit the city."

Hippolytus (*in Gen.* ii. 8, Achelis, liii. 1) demonstrates that *paradise* is not "in heaven," but is "part of the creation," because "our own eyes see the rivers that proceed from it"; it is "a region in the East, and a place of election."

Origen also locates *paradise* on the earth: "I think the several saints on their departure from this life will abide in some spot situated on the earth, which the divine scripture calls *paradise*, as in a place of instruction, so to speak, a lecture-hall or school of souls" (*de princ.*, II. xi. 6). Thence they will

progress according to proficiency through the several *mansiones* or spheres to the kingdom of heaven. In *mart. coh.*, xxxvi., he definitely links the "*paradise* of God" with Genesis: Christ will lead thither his martyrs "past the cherubim and the flaming sword which . . . guards the road to the tree of life." And the identification is supported by his view (*de princ.*, IV. iii. 1 [16]) that the events (not the site) of the Genesis-paradise are to be interpreted figuratively, not as "physical" history.

Methodius again, the stout assailant of Origenism, speaks indeed of our "restoration into *paradise* and change to immortality" (*symp.*, iv. 2, 94) as involving apparently a spiritual mode of life: "as the angels in heaven, so shall we be in *paradise*, no longer occupied in marriages and feastings, but in the contemplation of God" (*de res.*, I. li. 2). Nevertheless, he puts *paradise* on earth. "*Paradise*, from which we were ejected in the person of the first-formed man, is a chosen place obviously of this earth" (*ibid.*, I. lv. 1): and he proceeds to claim that a careful exegesis of 2 Cor. xii. 2-3 will disclose a distinction in the apostle's mind between *paradise* and the third heaven.

V

Athanasius, as we might expect, though no less biblical, is slightly more theological. Christ "showed us . . . a way into *paradise*, from which Adam was cast out, into which he re-entered through the thief [Luke xxiii. 43], . . . into which Paul also once entered; and a way up to the heavens, where the Lord in His humanity entered as precursor for us" (*exp. fid.*, 1 *fin.*). We notice here (*a*) that *paradise* is linked with Genesis, Luke, and 2 Corinthians impartially, and (*b*) that it is distinguished from heaven, into which no humanity is actually stated to have entered as yet but that of Christ. In *c. Gent.*, ii. *ad fin.*, Athanasius concludes a description of Adam's life, in the body but not of it, with the mention of "the contemplation of spiritual things which he enjoyed in that place which the holy Moses figuratively called *paradise* (*i.e.*, a *garden*)."

Cyril of Jerusalem and Basil again maintain the connection between the primeval and the eschatological *paradise*. "When thou renouncest Satan . . . the *paradise* of God is opened to thee which he planted towards the East, whence . . . our first-father was banished" (Cyr. H., *cat.*, xix. 9): "because we did not fast we were banished from *paradise* . . . do you not see how Lazarus through fasting entered into *paradise?*" (Bas., *hom. de jejun.*, i. 4, Ben., ii. 3C). Epiphanius (*ancor.*, lviii.) syllogistically demonstrates from the present existence of the human race that Eden was no allegory, but a genuine earthly home.

VI

In Gregory of Nyssa there first seems to be a suggestion of *paradise* being employed to denote final bliss. In *ep.* iii. (M. 46, 1021D) he speaks of the unsevered deity of Christ "with his soul in *paradise*, opening up the entry to human beings through the thief." By his *body*, apparently, Christ destroyed the power of hades (*in Christ. res.*, i., M. 46, 616D to 617A); by his soul he entered "the Jerusalem above, which we believe to be no other than *paradise*" (*ibid.*, 617B). And *in Cant.* (M. 44, 772C) he writes "the transformation of the corruptible to incorruption, the delight of *paradise*, the glory of the kingdom, the bliss that has no end."

With Gregory we may compare Macarius Æg. (*hom.* xxv. 7), "make haste to enter into the holy city, the Jerusalem that is at peace and is most high, where also is *paradise*."

VII

With Chrysostom we return to older ways of thought. *Paradise* was not in heaven, but on the earth (*in Gen.*, xiii. 3); and its rivers were real material streams, not spiritual allegories (*in Joh.*, xlvi. 4). Its gates were closed to the human race for 5,000 years and more, but were reopened on Good Friday (*de cruc. et latr.*, i. 2, ii. 404D), when Christ "entered into the holy fatherland, and with himself introduced the thief" (*ibid.*, 405A). (*Paradise* is the fatherland of the human race because our first ancestors derived their origin thence: he does not mean heaven, the fatherland of the divine Son. This will be still more clear in a moment.) So "he destroyed the curse and brake the gates of hades, and opened *paradise*" (*de glor.*, iii., iii. 145C), and "the thief again after all his wickedness, because he did not despair, entered before all others into *paradise*" (*de poen.*, i. 2, ii. 281E). Clearly Chrysostom connects *paradise* with the immediate restoration to men, through the harrowing of hell, of the spiritual privileges forfeited in Eden: though there seems to be no trace of earth-bound materialism in his view of *paradise* as a present state of souls.

But *paradise* and heaven are two very different things, and man is ultimately destined for heaven. Consequently, in discussing baptism (*in Joh.*, xxv. 2, xxvi. 1), Chrysostom contrasts its effects with the primeval life of man in Eden. "*Paradise* was entrusted to us, and we were shown unworthy to dwell even there, yet he has led us up to heaven. We were not found faithful in the first state, yet he has committed to us greater."

Elsewhere (*serm. in Gen.*, vii. 4 and 5, iv. 679 *ff.*), in a very important passage of an earlier series of discourses, he anticipates much of the argument traced above, and adds something more. The devil cast Adam out of *paradise:* Christ led into *paradise* the simple thief before all the world and the apostles, to encourage mankind against despairing of salvation—and this without any extended penance, straight "from the cross to heaven, from condemnation to salvation." The thief's bliss was not complete; his body did not enter into *paradise.* Moreover, we are promised what eye hath not seen nor ear heard; yet *paradise* has already been experienced by Adam. There remains, then, some further hope: "God promises to lead us not into *paradise,* but into heaven itself: he did not preach the kingdom of *paradise,* but the kingdom of heaven . . . you lost *paradise,* but God has given you heaven." Then follows an explanation of this fact (as above) in terms of baptism. So that the thief has not yet reached his final bliss.

But here an objection is raised. The thief had spent a wild life—he was "a fellow who had never heard sublime doctrines, knew nothing of prophecy, . . . and had never even put his head inside a church"; he did not know what the expression "kingdom of heaven" meant; suppose that Christ called it *paradise* here (Luke xxiii. 43) as a popular concession to ignorance; then the thief *was* promised entry "to-day" into heaven. Granted, replies Chrysostom. But he qualifies "this rather violent interpretation" by adducing many instances both from Scripture and from common parlance in which the present tense is used proleptically. Just as a sick man, when all hope of recovery is past, "is dead for all that concerns the physicians, so the thief, when there is no further prospect of his return to perdition, has entered into heaven. . . . Listen to what Paul says, proving that no one has yet received the reward of bliss"; and he quotes Heb. xi. 13, 40 ("these all died in faith, not having received the promises . . . that without us they should not be perfected"). So, on any view, if on this one occasion *paradise* was (abnormally) intended to mean heaven, the poor thief is still waiting to arrive there.

In fact, to Chrysostom *paradise* properly means not heaven, but a state of souls relieved from earth's trials and restored after life's probation to the spiritual condition of unfallen, but by no means perfected, humanity. When he speaks above of the thief's leap "from the cross to heaven," this rhetorical flourish must not be permitted to outweigh the carefully argued interpretation which succeeds it, or the contrary statements made in the later writings from which we have already quoted.

VIII

In a passage of Basil of Seleucia (*vit. Theol.*, i. 273, M. 85, 553A, B.) *paradise* is distinguished again both from heaven and from hades (=hell), and the description given of it seems to echo notions of a millennarian feast. "Through you I learnt how undefiled and endless is the kingdom in heaven and the everlasting blessedness of the saints. Through you I learnt how boundless . . . are the terrors and punishments in hades . . . of Tartarus. . . . Through you I learnt the delights of *paradise*, its untroubled satisfaction, its toilless self-provided banquet." And Cosmas Indic. undoubtedly regarded *paradise* as an intermediate state for the righteous: "After their departure from the body the souls of the righteous who are counted worthy to enter into the kingdom of heaven are laid up in *paradise* (as we are taught in the passage about the thief who was crucified with the Lord), to be preserved . . . until the resurrection" (*top.*, ix., M. 88, 412A). This *paradise* he places in the land beyond "the sea which the Gentiles name Oceanus" (*ibid.*, v. 209C).

We may compare with this the view of the unknown fifth-century author of [Just. Mart.] *quæst. et resp. ad orth.*, who says (*resp.*, lxxv.) that at death the righteous and unrighteous are sharply distinguished, and the souls of each are carried to appropriate abodes. Those of the righteous go to *paradise*, where they enjoy converse with angels, and have a vision of their Saviour; and there "they are guarded till the day of the resurrection and recompense." Again, in *resp.* lxxxv., he states that those saints who arose with their bodies at Christ's death (Matt. xxvii. 52) are with Enoch and Elijah "in *paradise*, awaiting the transformation . . . with which, as the divine apostle says, 'we shall all be changed.'" (The words omitted are obscure, but seem to mean that this transformation is "at present eternally complete with respect to Christ's resurrection [only].")

Finally, John of Damascus has a chapter on *paradise* in his *fid. orth.* (ii. 11), of which he summarizes the conclusions later in the course of Book ii., chapter 30. By *paradise* he understands "a home that was alike spiritual and sensible. Man lived in the body on the earth in the realm of sense, while he dwelt in the spirit among the angels, cultivating divine thoughts." "Being intermediate between God and matter, he was destined, if he kept the command, to be delivered from his natural relation to existing things, and to be made one with God's estate." These extracts admirably sum up the course of Greek patristic thought upon the subject, treating *paradise* as both a primeval earthly home, and also a spiritual state not of perfection already consummated, but of promise and advance towards final spiritual bliss.

IX

Theophylact, archbishop of Bulgaria in the late eleventh century, with caution, after due argument, concludes that although the saints have not yet been endowed with the totality of the royal gifts of Christ, they have at any rate obtained admission to his palace, and "are nevertheless both in the kingdom and in *paradise*"—and that *paradise* means the kingdom of heaven (*in Luc.*, xxiii. 43, M. 123, 1105B, C).

X

The theological conceptions of the Christian apocryphal acts and apocalypses are so extravagant and inconsistent that they require separate, though brief, treatment. In *act. Pil.* (or *Gospel of Nicodemus*), ii. 9 (25) *paradise* seems to mean a *refrigerium* for the saints delivered from hades, and others. In *act. Phil.*, cxxxvii., it is an abode of bliss for the souls of saints. In *dorm. Mar.* xxxix., xlviii., the blessed Virgin's body is translated thither; in *act. Andr. et Matt.*, xv., Abraham's soul is in *paradise*, but his body still in the tomb. *Apoc. Joh.*, xxv., states that hereafter "*paradise* will be uncovered, and the whole universe and *paradise* will become one, and the righteous will be on the face of the whole earth with my angels," quoting Ps. xxxvii. 29 ("the righteous shall inherit the earth").

XI

Certain metaphorical (as distinct from allegorical) uses of *paradise* are worth recording.

In *ep. Diogn.*, xii., those who love God are said to become "a *paradise* of delight, a fruitful tree" (*cf. ps. Sol.*, xiv. 2, "the *paradise* of the Lord, the trees of life, such are his saints"). Origen (*de orat.*, xxv. 3) speaks of the garden of the soul, "that the Lord may walk in us as in a spiritual *paradise*," and *in Jer.*, 1 *fin.* contrasts this *paradise* with heathen groves.

Clement (*Strom.*, vi. 1, ii. 4) calls Christ "our spiritual *paradise*, into whom we are planted"; and Macarius Æg. (*hom.* xxxvii. 1) bids us "keep each his own heart . . . guarding in it the word like *paradise* . . . and not listening to the serpent that wriggles in."

Later writers call Mary the *paradise*; thus Modestus (*encom.*, M. 86, 3305A) "Hail Mary, the spiritual and most exceeding glorious *paradise*, since by the Holy Ghost thou didst produce the fruit of life which groweth out of God the Father . . . even Christ," and John Eub. (*in conc. deip.*, xii., M. 96, 1480A), "Blessed are ye, Joachim and Anna, because ye have begotten

the reasonable *paradise* . . . for she has borne the planter of creation and of *paradise*."

The Bible is also called a *paradise*. So Chrysostom (*quod util. lect. script.*, i., iii., 71C): "The reading of the divine scriptures is indeed a spiritual meadow and *paradise* of delight"—a better *paradise* than that in Eden, because universal in the souls of believers. He makes similar statements *de capt. Eutr.* i. (iii. 386B *ff.*)—where, however, *paradise* means a garden simply—and elsewhere. Cyril Alex. (*in Joh.*, 2C) also calls the actual books of the Bible a spiritual *paradise* or *garden*, and John Mon. (*can. in Bas., ode* ix., M. 96, 1376C) sings that Basil had "flitted around the intellectual *gardens* of Scripture."

"*Paradise*" is also the sub-title of a book called *History of the Monks in Egypt* (M. 65, 441A), to some form or variation of which a reference appears to be made in *prat. spir.* of John Mosch. (M. 87, 3104C), "we were reading in the *Paradise* the apophthegms of the holy fathers."

LEONARD PRESTIGE.

BISHOP WESTON OF ZANZIBAR

I

ONE of the earliest things which drew attention to Dr. Weston, as a missionary priest in Central Africa, was his book on the Incarnation, entitled *The One Christ*. He humbly introduced it with the disparaging remark that it was written "in a country where books are few, and which is far away from all centres of theological thought." But this product of lonely meditation in Zanzibar made itself felt in Oxford, where Professor Sanday was greatly struck by it. "Written," he said, "in mental solitude and isolation, it is concerned with high themes, and treats them with marked originality and with sustained earnestness and devotion."* The critical Oxford professor added about the author, "He is a devout son of the Church, and has written throughout with absolute loyalty; but at the same time he has followed his thought where it led him."† The principle to which Weston adhered was this: "We are free within the limits laid down by the Creeds of Christendom."‡

What impresses the reader most about this book is that it is written in a spirit of deeply religious contemplation. This missionary priest delighted in dogma. But dogma was no mere exercise for the intellect.

* *Modern Christologies*, p. 169. † *Ibid.*, p. 172.
‡ *The One Christ*, p. 76.

The doctrines of the faith not only enlightened his mind, they awakened devotion and adoration. He rejoices in their extraordinary value, and feels their power over human life. They are intensely practical. It is a beautiful book, glowing with love for the Christ who has shown such love and condescension.

II

After seven years this book was reprinted. But it was not in those days very widely known. Like most theological works, it was studied by the few. What drew public attention to the author was his action as Bishop against the Protestant attempts at intercommunion in East Africa in 1913. A number of missionaries, representing various denominations which were not in communion with each other, met at Kikuyu, under the presidency of the Bishop of Uganda, to organize a scheme of federation. The argument of the Low Churchmen was that, "In British East Africa practically the only services for Europeans through the greater part of the Protectorate are those held in connection with the Church of England." Now in these places "there are living devout non-Episcopalians, whose sole opportunity of communicating, perhaps for years at a time, is to be met in an Anglican Church. They are not confirmed, neither are they ready and desirous to be so. But they are recognized communicants in their own Churches at home, and anxious to join with us in the highest act of Christian worship. They can communicate nowhere else. Are they to be repelled?"* The Low Church contention was that they ought not to be.

But then what was to be done for the Anglican residing in a district where no Episcopal Church existed? The Low Church view of this contingency was, "We should expect our convert there to meet with no less a welcome than we would ourselves extend to one from another Mission."† That is, they were willing that the Anglican should receive the Communion from a minister who was not a priest.

This Conference ended with a celebration of Holy Communion held in a Presbyterian place of worship; the celebrant was an Anglican, but Nonconformists were invited to receive the Sacrament.‡

Now it was this Kikuyu Conference and its sequel which roused the Bishop of Zanzibar to make an extraordinarily vigorous protest—in a letter to the Bishop of St. Albans of that date.

* *The Kikuyu Conference*, by the Bishop of Uganda, p. 13.
† *Ibid.*, p. 14. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

He complained that the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda were endeavouring to establish a new united Protestant Church of East Africa, which omitted Confirmation, Absolution, Episcopacy, sanctioned the celebration of the Eucharist without a priest, and ignored the existence of any such institution as the Catholic Church.*

Accordingly the Bishop of Zanzibar declared that these contradictions hindered the work of the Mission, stultified their witness, and forced him to speak out and protest that if the Church of England was prepared to allow this "exceeding chaotic system of Truth, she is entirely unfit to send missionaries to heathen or Mohammedan lands."†

"I am now in my sixteenth year of missionary work; to it I have given my best years, and for it I have gladly sacrificed tastes and aspirations that fail of satisfaction in the isolation of our tropical life. Why, then, do I begin to doubt? Simply because the Ecclesia Anglicana is content to have lost her power of self-expression, so that we out here can no longer appeal to her Voice, or rest upon her Witness."‡

And, therefore, the Bishop of Zanzibar appealed to the Archbishop of Canterbury; charged the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda with heresy in their teaching of the meaning and value of Episcopacy; adding further that, in his opinion, "they and their followers are seriously wrong in remaining in an Episcopal Ministry which is to them merely an outward form, and to their Protestant neighbours a rock of offence."

The Archbishop of Canterbury held that the facts before him afforded no case for proceedings against the Bishops of Uganda and Mombasa for heresy and schism, but resolved to obtain the opinion of the Central Consultative Body of the Lambeth Conference. On receiving their reply the Archbishop maintained that the admission to Holy Communion of persons "belonging to other denominations," and who "have not been episcopally ordained," was a question on which it was "right to leave large responsibility with the Diocesan Bishop." But this reception of Communion in other denominations could not be mutual. The concession granted was not to include a "sanction directly or by implication given to members of our Church to receive the Holy Communion at the hands of Ministers not episcopally ordained. To imagine that the occasional admission of non-Episcopalians, who, in special circumstances, seek the Holy Communion at our hands, carries or implies a corresponding readiness to bid the members of our Church, when temporarily isolated, seek the Holy Communion at the hands of any Christian Minister, though not episcopally ordained, who may be within

* *Eccles. Anglic.*, p. 8. † *Ibid.*, p. 1. ‡ *Ibid.*

reach, to whatsoever denomination or system he belongs, is gravely to misapprehend the position, and to run the risk of creating serious confusion."

The English Church Union supported the Bishop of Zanzibar with vigour. It reminded English people that the doctrine of the Church has always been, "Let that be held to be a valid Eucharist which is under the Bishop or one to whom he shall have committed it; and that only in such a Eucharist can the Divine Gift be sought by Catholic Christians." It noted the fact that the Archbishop of Canterbury refused to sanction the proposed practice of seeking Communion at the hands of ministers not episcopally ordained. It expressed its "unalterable conviction that any invitation on the part of Diocesan Bishops to members of separatist bodies, sanctioning their communicating at the altars of the Church . . . would be contrary to the principles of the Catholic Church, as well as to a distinct rule of the Church of England."

III

The Modernist tendencies in doctrine, and the liberal school of Biblical criticism, found an ardent opponent in the Bishop of Zanzibar. He put his whole soul into the pastoral letter, entitled "The Christ and His Critics." He felt, and felt with all the practical insight of a mission priest, that the critics were often afflicted with an academic intellectualism which disabled them from realizing the value of dogma in human life. But he failed to distinguish between criticism incompatible with belief in the Deity of Christ and criticism consistent with that fundamental belief. He would have been more effective had he been more restrained. The terms in which he criticized opponents are not entirely justified by the evidence which he quoted. But so intense was his conviction of the wrongfulness of advancing liberals to the Episcopate* that he dissociated himself in this matter from the Metropolitan and Synod of Canterbury, and stood on the verge of renouncing official allegiance, which, as he himself admitted,† might sacrifice the whole Universities Mission to his own conscience.

In his contentions with Modernism and Biblical criticism of the day, it was almost inevitable that the Bishop should hardly be abreast of actual conditions of European thought, or really able to appreciate the conclusions which most present-day students of the Bible accept.

I am not sure quite whether the Bishop realized how far his comprehensive and uncompromising denunciation of the modern

* *Eccles. Anglic.*, p. 143. † *Ibid.*, p. 145.

critic would really extend. He scarcely seems at times to leave room in the Church for what Bishop Gore, in his pamphlet on the Infallible Book, calls the moderate school, whose conclusions the overwhelming body of careful and believing critics accept. But all this was a natural consequence of his isolation.

Bishop Weston's own exposition of the Incarnation, given in "Christ and His Critics," founded on the language and terminology sanctioned by age-long tradition, found critics within the English Episcopate. Dr. Temple, Bishop of Manchester, speaking of the traditional terminology, and referring to this book, says:

"The difficulties of this position are indicated by the fact that Dr. Weston, the Bishop of Zanzibar, when engaged in defending orthodoxy, is, through his adherence to the traditional use of terms, brought as near to an explicit adherence to the Monothelite heresy as a man could well come without an avowed acceptance of it."*

Whatever the ultimate verdict may be on Bishop Weston's exposition of the doctrine of Incarnation, there is one outstanding and unquestionable fact—namely, that he knew by living experience the converting and uplifting power of the great dogmas of the Lord's Divinity over human nature in the Mission Field. The Christ of the liberal critic, the highly inspired human being, was not the Christ whom he could have sacrificed his life to proclaim. "The point is," he said, "that the Christ of whom they have experience is one, and the Christ of whom I have experience is quite another. Indeed, it comes to that . . . Jesus as the liberals know Him is not Jesus as I know Him.† Their Jesus is more different from my Jesus than our God from the Moslem's Allah. The God of Jesus and the God of Islam at least have the notion of Divine Majesty in common; Jesus of the liberals and my Jesus have nothing in common but the name.‡ Their Jesus is a fallible Jew; my Jesus is the God by whom the Universe was made. Is it, then, surprising if we simple, ignorant missionaries feel and speak strongly about liberalism?"

IV

Bishop Weston found time to write another book on the vexed question of devotion before the Reserved Sacrament. He called it *God With Us*, the meaning of the Tabernacle. He wrote with personal experience of prayer before the Reserved Sacrament over a period of more than twenty years. He distinguished between the Presence of Christ within us, and the

* Bishop Temple, *Christus Veritas*, p. 62. † *Ibid.*, p. 67.
‡ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

Presence of Christ on His throne in Heaven, and the Presence of Christ external to us in the Sacrament. He held that the indwelling Presence of Christ in the heart leaves ample room for the external Presence in the Sacrament reserved. Christ's Presence in the Reserved Sacrament is, he declares, continuous, not intermittent; not only there at moments when the Reserved Sacrament is utilized for reception, but at all times after the hour of its consecration.* He told a startling story of a saint, who died not many years ago (he does not give the name), who "was so alive to Christ's presence, in the sacramental mode, that he was able to detect the absence of the sacrament from a Tabernacle fully veiled, with its lamp burning.† He knew Christ's presence was not there vouchsafed externally. His companion argued, from the veil and the burning lamp, that certainly the Host was present. Inquiry was made. The saint was right. The sacrament had been removed. He knew; he did not require outward signs."‡

That passage is too characteristic of the writer to be ignored. I do not know what impression it made upon the readers. It is certainly not for us to place limits upon the penetration with which it may please our Lord to endow a saint. But, admitting the possibility, ought we not to be told the name of the saint, and to be allowed to know the evidence More especially as the writer says elsewhere, "We may justly urge the evidence of those who have, by experience, personal conviction of the presence apart from Communion," adding, "To this I have made reference already in another connection; I merely recall it here."§ But this "merely recalling" an anonymous experience, and yet using it as evidence, is more likely to raise misgivings than to encourage faith. Can it be regarded as a persuasive argument for the unconvinced? Do they not need more solid grounds than mere assertions in so serious a matter?

The Bishop further adds, "The evidence of very many well-qualified witnesses that Churches in which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved have an atmosphere entirely different from other Churches."‖ But this claim of difference in the atmosphere raises many problems which would need to be very carefully weighed and considered. Whatever the value of such experience may be, it is subjective and personal. It is a matter upon which the Church has pronounced no opinion, and to which the Church is by no means committed.

* *God With Us.* † *Ibid.*, pp. 26, 27. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 27.
§ *Ibid.*, p. 52. ‖ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

V

At intervals, but rarely, he reappeared for a short space in England. One great occasion was the Lambeth Conference of 1920. And there the assembled Bishops came to see him in what was, for some of them, an entirely unexpected light. What they found was not the controversialist, but the intensely spiritual mind, the personal devotion to our Lord, the sympathy with all that, in the best sense of the word, is Evangelical, the ardour of a living faith and a strong conviction, and firm loyalty to the unalterable Gospel. These were the characteristics of this intrepid champion of Catholicity which now appeared, gentle, persuasive, captivating the hearts of that great gathering of the Bishops, leading them to say unexpected words of admiration and approval. Certainly the late Bishop of Chelmsford, by his antecedents and his theological tendencies, had exceedingly little in common with the Bishop of Zanzibar. Yet no one surpassed him in appreciation of the African prelate's truly evangelical zeal.

What the late Bishop of Chelmsford said of him is this: " Of the unofficial members (of the Lambeth Conference) the one of all others who impressed the Conference was the Bishop of Zanzibar. As is well known, I differ most profoundly with many of the opinions which he holds, but no Bishop in the Conference impressed it more from a spiritual standpoint than the Bishop. His lofty tone, his abandonment of mere party even when maintaining his own position, his deep devotion and loyalty to his Lord, which was manifest in every speech, made the whole Conference feel that, however much it might differ from him on many points, they were listening to one who truly lived near his Lord."

That is a very remarkable and generous tribute from one whose school of thought was certainly very different from that of the Universities Mission.

I am not sure that the clergy, or, indeed, the laity, when they belong to different schools, are over-addicted to mutual admiration. But this cordial and genuine expression of an Evangelical for a Catholic is a remarkable proof of the sympathy of the one and the character of the other.

VI

Where the Bishop of Zanzibar showed all his fervour and conviction most powerfully was in his last words at the Anglo-Catholic Congress of 1923.

He called on Anglo-Catholics " to make such a surrender of

self to Christ over the whole area of our life that, were He to choose to come on earth to reign in His own Person, neither you nor I would find it necessary to alter the principles upon which we conduct our whole life."* He made a most earnest appeal for priests and workers. "We need the young men in the priesthood, if God calls. We need the women in the religious life, we need them in the work of teaching for the Church. We need men and women, priests and other workers, abroad in the Mission Field. And where are they? Why don't they come? Because we are not yet recalled to the Christ of Calvary. There is no other reason."† He made a most touching appeal to parents. He asked them what the Christ of Calvary had to say to them. "Do you forget Who it was who lived alone that He might carry His Cross? Do you forget how His Mother was bidden to be content and live with the beloved disciple? Fathers and Mothers, can you not give to Jesus some of the joy He has given to you? Dedicate your children. Rejoice that they should go into priesthood, into the religious life. Look at the Catholics in Ireland—five and six of one family are in the priesthood and in religious orders. Look in France, the number of men and women from one household in priesthood and in religion. And then look in your English homes! I recall you to the Christ of Calvary: listen to Him, brethren."‡ He appealed to Anglo-Catholics to cultivate obedience. "I ask for obedience to Bishops in as far as they obey the Catholic Church."§

And last, with regard to perpetual Reservation of the Sacrament, he called on them "not to yield one inch to those who would for any reason . . . deprive them of their tabernacles." "But I say to you, and I say it to you with all the earnestness that I have, if you are prepared to fight for the right of adoring Jesus in His Blessed Sacrament, then when you come out from before your tabernacles, you must walk with Christ, mystically present in you, through the streets of this country, and find the same Christ in the people of your cities and your villages. You cannot claim to worship Jesus in the tabernacle, if you don't pity Jesus in the slum. Now mark that. It is the Gospel truth."||

There is no sort of doubt that this huge assembly was stirred to its very depth. At the same time, there is no wonder that his fervid and challenging utterances provoked hostility in certain directions.

His reply deserves reading. It will be found in what he wrote *In Defence of the English Catholic*, which can be bought for a shilling.

* *God With Us*, p. 29. † *Ibid.*, p. 32. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 33.
§ *Ibid.*, || *Ibid.*, p. 34.

VII

The Bishop of Zanzibar was regarded by members of certain schools as an undisguised Roman. It is therefore only reasonable to remember what he taught concerning Rome and secessions from the English Church.

He held that *present* claims are made for the Papacy which no Anglo-Catholic can rightly accept.

"We are bidden to deny that we are bishops and priests of the Catholic Church; and to confess that our Sacraments are not valid, Catholic Sacraments. To yield to this Roman claim is to deny Christ in our priesthood and in our Sacraments. . . . We cannot deny that we *are* bishops and priests and have said Mass, absolved sinners, and confirmed God's people."*

He said that in the Roman Church bishops "have not apostolic freedom, nor have they full power within their dioceses. They are held bound to renew their faculties from time to time; and are liable to have their faculties withdrawn by the Pope." He illustrated this from the time of the Vatican Council of 1870, which declared the Pope to be infallible. "Bishops who dissented from its teaching were compelled to promulgate it under threat of withdrawal of faculties. Thus the Pope is given, by present Roman custom, a power over Bishops that does not find any authority in the earlier ages of the Church. And this custom cannot be acknowledged as Catholic and Apostolic."†

He also contended that the literal meaning of the Vatican Decrees is "not in harmony with the facts of history."‡ "As it stands the wording is impossible to Anglo-Catholics as to Orthodox Catholics. What is wanted is an official explanation that will make the Papal definitions cover all the facts."§

From his lonely diocese, in its tropical heat and privation, he watched with profound distress the appointment to English sees, through State influence, of Bishops who showed no sympathy with Catholic principles, and some of whom publicly expressed their doubt concerning certain Articles of the Faith. He made his protests more than once, whether wisely or not, at any rate ineffectually. But he never for a moment lost faith in the English Church, any more than St. Paul lost faith in the Church of Corinth in spite of its serious contradictions and anomalies. Never was he drawn towards Rome—which in his eyes had incurred the grievous responsibility of making unauthorized additions to the faith. A Catholic he always was. A Roman he could not be. He dissociated himself, publicly,

* *In Defence of the English Catholic*, p. 11. † *Ibid.*, pp. 11, 12.
‡ *Ibid.*, p. 12. § 1923.

definitely, from men in authority who were committing the English Church to un-Catholic ideas. But he worked on perseveringly, unremittingly, as an Anglican Bishop, to Catholicize the Mohammedans of Zanzibar.

VIII

If at times this noble-hearted man was more outspoken than diplomatic, then remember that the Church of England experiences quite enough diplomacy at home. It is always a prophet's or reformer's fate to seem extravagant to those who are neither. In the isolation of his distant Diocese, deprived of opportunities to acquire intimate knowledge of the feelings of the hour, hindered by limited access to the literature of his time, without many advisers, and always under the enervating influence of a climate which affects the nerves and tends to feverish excitement and irritablity; in the region popularly known as the white man's grave, he sacrificed, as he pathetically said, "tastes and aspirations which fail of satisfaction in the isolation of a tropical life." What wonder if he made mistakes while he achieved so much? He made the name of Zanzibar well-known throughout the length of England. His utterances in that far-off island vibrated throughout all the Church at Home. Those who would see him in his least controversial moods, at his devotional best, should read his book on *The Revelation of Eternal Love*.

IX

But before all things else the Bishop of Zanzibar was a Missionary. It was in the conversion of the pagan and Mohammedans that he found the work for which he was meant. It was the African people whose cause was always in his mind, and often on his lips. He sympathized with them from the very depth of his soul. "We who live in Africa, right up against humanity untouched by sacramental grace, among those who can draw no cheque upon the bank of accumulated Christian ideas, may be excused if we have little confidence in man's moral sense."* But then he could go on, Frank by name and frank by nature, to tell us what he thought of our English self-content.

"To be candid, I do not trust the moral sense even of a Christianity that tolerates slum-life, sweating, and false distinctions between man and man; that approves the class distinctions which priests and prelates foster in our Lord's name, and that gives chief weight in its counsels to men and women of one particular level of culture, education, and social position."

* *The Christ and His Critics*, p. 23.

No doubt the story will be fully told one day, how he rose in defence of the native African against the greed of the profiteer and the tyranny of the Prussian. For in that devotion to the ignorant and oppressed lies the noblest of his endeavours.

The Universities Mission has exercised a romantic fascination all its own among the foreign Missions of the English Church, partly because of the terrible climate and the costly sacrifice of invaluable lives which have laid the foundation of that African community, partly because of the noble succession of men who have been its Bishops. No one who was privileged to know Bishop Smythies, and realized what that man of magnificent kingly presence and splendid physique, to say nothing of his spiritual gifts, endured and suffered for his beloved Africans, will ever forget him. Bishop Weston was heir to a noble inheritance, and nobly did he maintain it.

And there at the early age of fifty-three he died. He gave for five-and-twenty years his splendid enthusiasm and devotion to the poor tribes of Central Africa. Everything else in his career was more or less accidental and by the way. His God-given energies were concentrated on bringing the light of the Cross into the darkest of places. His life has been an inspiration to many, who no doubt will inherit his spirit and continue his labours. A Church with such traditions has a glorious inheritance and a great responsibility.

W. J. Sparrow Simpson.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE article from the Bishop of Gibraltar which we publish to-day is the first of a series of four from his pen on the present position of the Eastern Churches. They will be published in successive numbers concluding in June, when we hope to publish a number of articles dealing with various aspects of the Council of Nicæa.

We have received a copy of *A Letter to the Right Reverend the Bishop of Gloucester*, by Members of the Federation of Catholic Priests in the Gloucester Diocese. It is a reasoned and learned comment on the Bishop's charge entitled *The Church of England*, and seems to us a model of what such writing should be. Its defence of the Eucharist as the chief service of Sunday and of the lawfulness of Reservation, and its criticism of the Bishop's plea for the recognition of Nonconformist ministries, are all the more weighty because they are so restrained.

The Rev. C. E. Turner, whose paper on the Church in Western Canada we published in January, writes to correct a misprint on p. 45. The figure "32,000" should be "30 to 2,000"—*i.e.*, a parish of twelve settlements.

A CORRESPONDENT points out the following passage from Dr. Abrahams' second series of *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, p. 80, bearing on the use of the Imprecatory Psalms:

"'The Angels,' it is said, 'wished to sing praises to God while the Egyptians were drowning in the sea, and God rebuked them, saying, Shall I listen to your hymns when my children are perishing before my eyes?' This was no mere pious expression, for the Passover liturgy of the synagogue has been permanently affected by this Rabbinic idea. On the Jewish festivals the noble series of Psalms of Praise (Hallel)—Psalms cxiii. to cxviii.—are a regular feature of the synagogue service. But on the seventh day of Passover these psalms are curtailed, on the basis of the Talmudic utterance thus cited. The Pharisees, and the religion derived from them, thus honour the text: 'When thy enemy falls do not rejoice.'"

STUDIES IN TEXTS

(*a*) PROVERBS XXV. 21, 22; ROMANS XII. 20

Commentators are agreed that, as St. Augustine and others have said, the expression as to "coals of fire" must mean the burning pangs of shame which a man will feel when good is returned for evil, and which may lead to remorse and penitence on the part of the evil doer.

But it must be evident that "coals of fire" refers to some custom, occasional or usual, of which the writer in Proverbs has availed himself and applied.

There is a singular dearth of suggestion as to what the custom was Psalm cxl. 9, 10, refers to destruction of the evil doer, not his reformation.

Proverbs xxv. has several similes: Height of heaven and depth of earth, 3; dross and silver, 4; apples in baskets, 11; golden ornaments, 12;

snow in harvest, 13; rainless wind, 14; maul, sword, and arrow and false witness, giving hurt, 18; broken tooth and disjointed foot, 19; garment lost in cold weather, action of vinegar on nitre, 20; north wind, 23; cold water for the thirsty, 25; muddy fountain and corrupt spring, 26; excess of honey, 27; city walls broken down, 28. In all these the comparison is with well-known things and the lesson evident; it is only the "coals of fire" which seems to lie outside usual experience.

A traveller in Palestine two or three years ago had his attention drawn to the cooking ovens which are commonly found outside the houses of people in fair circumstances; they are quite separate from the dwellings. In Lev. xxvi. 26 one of the signs of Divine judgment is the poverty of ovens, "ten women with only one oven." The traveller was told that at sundown poor people who had no proper ovens are allowed to come and take away the red-hot embers for culinary purposes in their more humble and ovenless homes. These burning embers they carry away in iron trays on their heads. It is a well-known form of generosity and highly appreciated by the poor. Should any of these poor people have had a quarrel during the day with some resident in the better-class houses, and yet be allowed to take his "coals of fire" home, it would be a mark of forgiveness. This is the clue to the meaning of the reference. What the writer of Proverbs and St. Paul in Romans meant was that such an act of generosity as the distribution of coals of fire from the ovens should be the simile of right behaviour to an enemy.

Thus all who knew of the custom here described would recognize the application. Ignorance of the custom leaves us in the dark. It is a simile without any actuality to support it.

A. T. Fryer.

(*b*) Proverbs xxii. 17-21

Theologische Literaturzeitung for November 1, 1924, reports an interesting discovery by A. Erman published in the Proceedings of the Prussian Academy. Dr. Wallis Budge in 1923 published a second series of *Egyptian Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum*, containing the "Teaching of Amem-em-hope." Erman finds that this is an Egyptian text-book of ethics used in schools, probably as early as the sixth century B.C. Evidently some Jew translated it into Hebrew or Aramaic, in which form it became one of the sources of Proverbs. The section xxii. 17 to xxiv. 22 is based upon it to a considerable extent. One or two examples must suffice.

Proverbs xxii. 17, 18, R.V.: "Incline thine ear, and hear the words of the wise, and apply thine heart unto my knowledge. For it is a pleasant thing if thou keep them within thee, if they be established together upon thy lips."

Amem-em-hope, beginning of book: "Incline thine ears, hear (my) words, apply thine heart to them to understand them. It is good if a man puts them in his heart, (but) woe to him who transgresses them."

Verse 20, R.V.: "Have not I written unto thee *excellent things* (?) of counsels and knowledge?" But the Hebrew word is *shlshm*—*i.e.*, thirty; and the literal rendering is, "Have not I written unto thee thirty with counsels and knowledge?" which was hitherto unintelligible, but is explained by the conclusion of Amem-em-hope: "Thou hast seen these thirty chapters, which are a joy and a teaching."

The "thirty" in Proverbs is meaningless except as a relic of the source.

W. K. L. C.

THE ARAMAIC PAPYRI

Dr. Cowley's splendid edition of the *Aramaic Papyri* (Oxford Press, 1923. 21s.) is a monument of English scholarship. These famous documents hail from a Jewish military colony at Elephantine, garrisoning the southern frontier of Egypt against the Ethiopians in the time of Ezra. They contain many legal documents, such as marriage settlements, house-leases, etc., a subscription list for the rebuilding of the local temple, a letter from Darius ordering the observance of the Passover, and, strangest of all, a request to the high priest at Jerusalem for help in rebuilding the temple, betraying no feeling that it could be regarded as schismatical. These papyri are the earliest Jewish texts we possess, except the Siloam inscription and ostraka from Samaria. They raise many problems, which are discussed by Dr. Cowley in his too short Introduction in a masterly manner. These are some of his conclusions.

Aramaic is used as the language of commerce and diplomacy, as it was in the Near East until Greek superseded it in Ptolemaic times. The writers are " the Jewish force " or " the Jews "; other Asiatics at Syene are called Aramæans. The Jews have their wives and families. Some have intermarried with the Egyptians. They are under a chief man with " his colleagues the priests."

Their religion probably continues the popular cults of Palestine in the pre-exilic period, and shows us what the prophets had to contend against. They worshipped Ya'u, and 'Anath, Bethel, Ishun, and Herem besides. 'Anath was a Syrian goddess, and was perhaps worshipped as the queen of heaven. The temple-fund was divided between Ya'u and 'Anath-bethel. Ya'u, however, was pre-eminent. Sacrifices are mentioned, but not the Law, or Moses or Aaron or the Levitical order, or the Sabbath.

Dr. Cowley's own theory is that the documents which formed the Torah existed, probably in cuneiform, in a very few copies, guarded by a priestly class. They were unknown to the people at large before Ezra, who, familiar with cuneiform, Aramaic and Hebrew, translated the tablets into Hebrew, welded them into a consistent whole, and wrote them down in Aramaic. The Law must have existed, or Ezra's recension would not have been accepted as Mosaic.

NOTE

THE RELIGIOUS OBJECTIONS TO BETTING

The immediate occasion of the writing of the following notes was the appearance in Theology last year of an editorial paragraph on the subject of a tax upon betting. But the opinions which I express have been struggling to formulate themselves in my mind for some time in response to the practical needs of my work in a northern industrial parish.

The Editor in the paragraph referred to inclines to favour some kind of State regulation of betting, which would recognize it and legalize it, but would remove some of the most objectionable accompaniments of the present system by substituting the totalizator for the bookie. He notes that this has been done with success in New Zealand, although the number of people betting has not decreased and may have increased. The

practical conclusion at which he arrives is based upon the belief that betting "is not in itself a sin, but may easily become one" when the element of covetousness enters into it. The bookie and betting tout exist to stimulate covetousness; hence their removal is the condition precedent to any reform.

My quarrel is not with the practical proposal, which would be admirable granted the soundness of the theoretical premise. But is betting "not in itself a sin"? If it is not, then State regulation is merely a matter of expediency on a par with temperance legislation. If it is, then the true parallel is, as some maintain, with the State regulation of prostitution, in which case Christians could have no hand in it. We can never agree upon any practical proposals until we have reached agreement upon the fundamental moral principles involved. It is just here that the Church seems to give us no clear guidance.

What are the grounds, then, upon which I defend the rigorist view—that betting is always in itself sinful without regard to the amount of money involved? Let me begin by saying that I look at the whole matter from the standpoint of a parish priest who wants to be able to give to his boy Confirmation candidates sound religious reasons against betting and gambling. Boys in workshops, offices, and factories cannot escape contact with others who bet and invite them to bet. They must have clear reasons for any attitute towards betting which we ask them to adopt.

I rule out of account the prudential argument that betting is a "mug's game," because I am concerned with religious reasons against it. Neither is the warning "not to bet beyond your means" admissible. It is no more applicable to betting than to any other extravagance. Besides, it is an appeal to selfish prudence, and leaves out of account the fact that every bet is a contract involving others. If I am to tell boys they must not bet, I must be able to tell them that it is *wrong* to do so, and I should be able to help them to see why it is wrong. If I can only warn them that it is dangerous—well, life is a dangerous thing and boys, if they are alive, enjoy taking risks. The following are the reasons for which I consider that betting is wrong in principle, a sin in the same sense as stealing or lying:

1. *It is an offence against the Golden Rule.*

If I make a bet and win, my gain is at the expense of someone else. Just as much as I win he loses. We both had our moments of anticipatory excitement in which we were equal, but now I enjoy a thrill of pleasure as my covetous desire is satisfied, whereas the loser endures the pain of disappointment. No one is happy to lose, otherwise a bet would be an indifferent thing and there would be no sense in making it. It adds to the excitement of a race, for example, because it makes the result of the race personal to the spectator in terms of profit and loss which he feels individually and materially. But no one bets expecting or hoping to lose. If the joys of Paradise are really enhanced by the sight of the damned in Gehenna, there would, of course, be warrant for benefiting by the discomfiture of others, but Christian eschatology does not endorse that particular speculation, I believe.

2. *It is in effect a repudiation of the sacramental nature of money.*

Money is a sacrament of worth. In itself money is nothing—it may be only pieces of paper and ink, or lumps of metal, but in its context of civilized life it is a means, a token, and a pledge of value. It cannot, it is true, represent the highest values of all—"a virtuous woman," for instance,

whose "price is above rubies." But the best things, it is a commonplace to say, "money cannot buy" because they must be won. Nevertheless, on its own level money is a sacramental thing because it is the outward and visible sign of the immaterial thing called "value." Its sacramental value may as it were burst the bands of its intrinsic worth, so that the widow's mite is ennobled for all time. But its primary purpose is to express and convey the value of work done, or goods received or services rendered. To make the possession of money depend not upon value given, but upon the toss of a coin, the chance disposition of cards in a pack, the incalculable possibilities of a horse race—this is to divorce it from its legitimate use. The result of such divorce is to make it desirable as an end in itself, because of the power which possession of it confers. It is then coveted for what it bestows, and ceases to bear any relationship to the deserts of the receiver. This false view of money as an end in itself, and not as a means to the end of a good life for all in proportion to the value of each, is the cause of all the evils in the body economic. A Christian theory of money cannot make its possession dependent upon chance.

3. *It substitutes chance for law.*

This brings me directly to my third reason. If, as our Christian faith compels us to believe, God is a God with a purpose, what place can there be for chance in the scheme of things? Surely we need to do everything in our power to teach that God is a God of order, working normally at least by the method of discoverable laws, working certainly and always towards a determined end. As a man sows so shall he reap. The labourer earns and is worthy of his hire. There is no crown which is not gained by bearing a cross. These and like maxims are Christian commonplaces. They are as far removed as possible from the fatalistic outlook which regards all honest and intelligent effort as vain because it conceives everything to be at the mercy of blind chance. The Christian believes that souls are to be made here in accordance with the spiritual laws which govern the making of souls. It is his business to discover those laws in their general sense and in their particular bearing upon himself—God's will for him—and to live in accordance with them. To dally with chance is to leave the serious business of our life here, the making of our souls, and to go off into a spiritual cul-de-sac. The products of such blind-alley occupations are variously embezzlers, suicides, Mr. Micawbers, or at best men into some part at least of whose lives the laws of God are denied admittance because there the goddess of chance is enthroned. Thus, gambling attacks character at its root because it distracts a man's attention from the business of observing and corresponding with God's law, and rivets it upon something capricious, unstable, and unknowable.

In the above remarks I have purposely refrained from making capital from the immense amount of human wreckage which the gambling habit casts up into the courts and prisons and workhouses and the suicides' graves. Such awful results may follow from the misuse of something whose proper use is legitimate, such as alcoholic drink. I have tried to show that it is not the *amount* of material damage which gambling does that counts—that is sufficiently obvious—but rather the *kind* of spiritual damage which it inflicts. The latter in the long run must have the most far-reaching effects, for it is a contagion which spreads easily and subtly amongst those who have not been rendered immune to it by the administration in time of a true religious antidote.

C. E. G. Goodall.

REVIEW

THE MODERN USE OF THE BIBLE*

In these days of considerable theological chaos the contribution which Anglicanism, as representing a sane and enlightened Catholicism, can make in the field of Biblical interpretation is of the first importance. We find ourselves, indeed, "between two fires." On the one hand, there is the intransigeant obscurantism of official Roman Catholicism and of a rapidly diminishing section of Protestantism; and on the other hand we have the Liberal Protestant attitude, of which Dr. Fosdick is an able, luminous, and moderate exponent. We turn gladly from such books as the Report of the Catholic Bible Congress held at Cambridge in 1921—a typical example of obscurantist unreality—to the obvious sincerity exhibited in the book under review, which consists of eight lectures delivered at Yale University. The writer begins by describing the new method of approach to the Bible, and rightly asserts that the higher criticism "once more integrates the Scriptures . . . and restores to us the whole book seen as a unified development from early and simple beginnings to a great conclusion." Yet even at the outset one wonders whether Dr. Fosdick's impression of the "modern mind" and its problems is supported by the facts. He pictures multitudes of pious churchgoers, living consistent and effective Christian lives, the kernel of whose difficulty is found in their inability to accept Biblical categories—"miracles, demons, fiat creation, apocalyptic hopes, eternal hell." But in reality is it not Christian ethics far more than Christian faith, the shackles of which the average modern longs to shake off? Loss of faith in hundreds of cases is the result rather than the cause of compromise with the world, the flesh, or the Devil.

After an interesting account of the light which has been shed on the interpretation of Scripture during the last century, the Church's traditional use of allegorism is discussed, and unreservedly condemned. It is simply one profitless attempt to harmonize the Bible with the modern world-view. Again, the matter is seriously complicated for the modern mind by "mental categories which we no longer use in ordinary life, like demonology, angelology, Semitic cosmology, or miracles." We are to "take our stand with the Master on this basic matter." But is it so certain that our Lord would condemn, for instance, Wyclif's interpretation of the Good Samaritan story? Was not the same principle involved when He spoke of the story of Jonah as an allegorical account of His own death and resurrection?

* *The Modern Use of the Bible*, by Harry Emerson Fosdick, D.D. S.C.M. 6s.

The lecture entitled "Abiding Experiences and Changing Categories" brings us to the heart of Dr. Fosdick's message; and here the influence of Ritschl and his "value-judgments" is apparent. "What is permanent in Christianity is not mental frameworks, but abiding experiences." Various illustrations are given of this. "I believe in the persistence of personality through death, but I do not believe in the resurrection of the flesh." This is intended to appeal at once to the modern's common sense, and to be in harmony with the true meaning of Scripture. But is not this arbitrary? A more modern mind and a more radical critic with a taste for comparative religion might say, "I believe in the existence of the personality in this life, but I regard its individual persistence through death as an open question." Another might say, "My training in philosophy has taught me not to be so dogmatic as to assert my own existence." The Church means far more by *resurrectio carnis* than merely the immortality of the soul. Again, "Devils may exist, but their functions are gone." It would be interesting to hear the comments of Catholic missionaries on this remark, or of others who have emerged from Spiritism to the light of Catholic truth. Dr. Fosdick anticipates some such criticism; but he only meets it with a *petitio principii*. "Wherever the modern doubt of demons comes in, the phenomena of demoniacal possession go out." In other words, those who on *a priori* grounds doubt the possibility of possession by devils explain the facts in some other way. This does not take us far towards deciding which explanation is the true one.

Angels, too, must go; belief in them is a crudity taken over from Zoroastrianism. "Gabriel has no place in our explanation of events." Where is it all leading? As we look around, the answer is not reassuring.

The next lecture is on "Miracle and Law." It would be easy to criticize at length Dr. Fosdick's treatment of the Gospel story. The reason, for instance, why St. Luke recorded the healing of Malchus' ear is surely more naturally found in the fact of his medical training than in the fact that he wrote later than St. Mark, and may therefore have added imaginary miracles. However, this chapter, on the whole, is the most constructive in the book; indeed, we are tempted to wonder whether the writer has himself faced all the implications of certain quotations which he gives. One example—from J. A. Thomson—must suffice. "The Uniformity of Nature, which the legalists hold over us as a sacrosanct principle, is a big assumption. For who shall define its tenure in a world of æonic flux?" We like especially the latter part of the lecture, where emphasis is laid on belief in miracles as a contemporary

challenge. The lecture which follows has also some fine passages, especially one on the revolutionary consequences of Christianity in our social relationships. It might almost come from Dr. Gore's pen, were it not in the American language.

In the last two lectures it emerges that Dr. Fosdick and his modern friends reject the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation. The point of view expressed is that which we have learnt to expect from Liberal Protestant sources. It is based upon the philosophy of immanence, and may be summed up in the words " Jesus was divine, the revelation of the living God who seeks to be incarnate in every one of us " (p. 271). It is not without significance that when interpreting Christ's divinity in terms which the modern mind can accept, Dr. Fosdick supports his words with a quotation from Mr. Claude Montefiore.

These last two lectures are really impressive, and yet pathetically inadequate. It is strange that the writer and his followers do not see that belief in Christ as God from all eternity to a Catholic is incomparably more than a metaphysical abstraction. It is the centre of our philosophy of the universe. Though Dr. Fosdick regards us as hopelessly old-fashioned, we are content still to sing to God and to the Incarnate Christ " *Te Deums*, calling upon angels and archangels, seraphim and cherubim, to fall before the throne " (p. 220).

This book illustrates once again the vital need for the guidance of the Church, without which interpretation of Scripture is arbitrary. It is well to remember that every modern mind is, in fact, different from every other. The Church is the guardian of Holy Scripture, and the depositary of truth. Under her loving guidance we welcome all scientific and critical investigations which can help us in drawing illumination from the incomparable book. In conclusion, we are moved in all seriousness to ask Dr. Fosdick the question, *Quo vadis ?*

FREDERICK HOOD

NOTICES

BELIEF AND PRACTICE

STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN SOCIOLOGY. No. 1, The Social Ideal of the Bible. By G. C. Binyon. Commonwealth Press, Letchworth. 1s. 6d.

CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP. The Story and Meaning of C.O.P.E.C. By Edward Shillito. Longmans, Green and Company. 3s. 6d.

THE ETHICAL TEACHING OF JESUS. By Professor Ernest F. Scott, D.D., of Union Theological Seminary, New York. Macmillan and Company. 6s.

"If our social views are organically connected with our religion," says Mr. Binyon in his Preface, "we cannot avoid the question of our attitude as to Churchmanship and Church tradition." It is a useful, stimulating Preface, because Mr. Binyon asks so many questions which ought to be asked, if "Christian Sociologists" are to be saved from slipshod thinking and hasty action. The cave of Adullam provides, in a common discontent, a bond of unity, but, once outside the cave, the "discontented" must think things over more positively. Hence Mr. Binyon's pertinent questions. What is meant by "Christian," and what by "Socialism" in the term "Christian Socialism"? Useful questions, but most useful of all, perhaps, is: "What position are we to take up as to Churchmanship and Church tradition?" Behind it there is the more academic, but none the less important, question of the connection between theological belief and ethical practice. Is it possible to reach effective agreement on questions of Christian practice before agreement on theological beliefs has been achieved? Is the attempt to work together before we can think together futile, or does it help us to think together?

The C.O.P.E.C. movement suggests similar enquiries. "Copec," says Mr. Shillito, "had no theological creed to which assent was demanded. Men had been led to its counsels by many ways. . . . But there was for all one starting-point, the belief in the God and Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ." Unfortunately this wide statement of belief may be as widely and as ambiguously interpreted, and some of the delegates at Birmingham must have longed, many times, for a common creed. The First Report—on the Nature and Purpose of God—is an attempt to make the doctrinal basis more effective, and the big demand for this Report is significant. If Copec leads to a new understanding that ethical ideals cannot stand in isolation, it will have done much. Meantime, as Mr. Shillito rightly claims, "the value of Copec lies in the method in which the preparations were made"—the method of combined and careful research before discussion.

One of the reasons for this preliminary study was the need to reach agreement on Ideals of Conduct before their application could be discussed. On some points Copec has revealed a divergence of opinion as to the ethical standards themselves, and, in view of this experience, it is rather difficult to accept Professor Scott's statement that "the unchanging element in our religion has been its ethical teaching. . . . The original gospel gave place, within fifty years, to a type of religion which was more Greek or Oriental than Jewish; this, in turn, was superseded by the ritualism of the medieval Church, and this by the varying phases of Pro-

testantism. Doubtless there has often been a real danger that the religion should lose its continuity, but it has remained the same in virtue of its ethical standards." It is hard to reconcile this claim with cold fact: strange doctrines have so often led to strange ethical standards, though it is true that some strange doctrines fell away, "not because they were logically disproved, but because they issued in a mode of life which was manifestly non-Christian." When Professor Scott insists that to separate Our Lord's "morality from His religion means nothing else than to tear it up by the roots," he admits dependence of Ethic on religious background, yet when he states "there have been times when the name of Christ seemed to be little more than a survival" in the Church, it is hard to see how this ethic survived, and harder still to see how it could be "the unchanging element." Apparently the Christian Ethic suffered violent change in the ages influenced by the ideals of Monasticism, for Professor Scott asserts that "monastic institutions have always defeated their own end" because of their exclusiveness, "for the Christian morality by its very nature can only be realized in a society in which all kinds of elements are freely mingled together." A very comforting doctrine for New York, but not so favourable to backwoodsmen, Esquimaux, or chronic invalids! This little book is more interesting than many of its kind, but it should be read critically.

R. H. L. Slater.

The Apostle John. By W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. Philadelphia, *Sunday School Times*. 6s.

This is a disappointing book. We hoped from the title that Dr. Thomas was offering us a constructive contribution to the Johannine problem; but not only does he leave unanswered elementary questions that would suggest themselves to the most uncritical mind, but his categorical treatment of the life provokes much questioning. He accepts uncritically the Church's most conservative tradition, that the Apostle is author of all the books that bear the name of St. John. As he does not derive it from the Bible (p. 346) we wonder why he abstains from further traditional information concerning St. John; but he strictly confines himself to the New Testament, and we must take Dr. Thomas' word for it, that John "was destined to remain for many a year and endure much suffering" (p. 81).

To study a man from records never primarily concerned with him is difficult enough, but Dr. Thomas has singularly failed to give us a clear conception of the Apostle. Every incident in which St. John may or does figure is selected, but is used as a "peg" for homiletic discourses on the Christian life.

Dr. Thomas warns us that his "material is set out largely in outline form," but the multitudinous headings, sub-headings, and symmetrical divisions make the book impossible reading; while as a book of reference it lacks an index.

The exegesis, moreover, is marred by lapses like the following: when we read "The Cross is of supreme importance: (1) Against Rationalism . . .; (2) Formalism . . .; (3) Romanism . . .; (4) Scepticism . . ." (p. 223); and we cannot understand how a learned doctor can think it worth while to give opinions of those who see in Rev. viii. 8, 9, references to the Prelacy, Rome, monks, Jesuits, etc.

Apart from such flaws, it is not a book we can recommend to serious students, or those who have made any advance in meditation, neither would we wish to give it to inexperienced Sunday-school teachers, with its light and sketchy treatment of deep subjects. Of the Agony in Gethsemane Dr. Thomas favours the idea "that the cup from which He prayed to be delivered was premature death then and there in the garden" (p. 61). The rendering (in support of his argument) of the "Greek" of Heb. v. 7, as: "He was heard by reason of His filial submission," is neither accurate nor supported by authorities, or by the punctuation of the latest texts. One cannot help feeling on reading this chapter entitled "Great Mysteries" that the author would rob the very mystery of Gethsemane of its depth.

There are arresting points worthy of future meditation, but how are they to be refound among such a mass of extraneous ideas, repetition, and forced alliteration? The Gospel is studied in a sevenfold division, and again under a twofold division subdivided into four chapters with numerous subdivisions—as it is also taken through again by paragraphs, in two chapters of outline studies, it is not surprising if there is much overlapping. "Peace of restfulness realized . . . peace of pardon, of power, of purity, of provision, of perception, of promise, and all because of the indwelling presence," is a typical example of the alliteration to be met with throughout the book.

The pronouns when referring to the Deity are not written with a capital, and in places cause confusion to the reader, who has to pause to find out if the pronoun is referring to St. John or Christ.

WINIFRED M. JONES.

SOME RECENT PAMPHLETS

PAPERS IN MODERN CHURCHMANSHIP. No. 2, The Nature of Punishment and Forgiveness. By Douglas White, M.D. No. 3, What is the Church? By the Very Rev. Hastings Rashdall, late Dean of Carlisle. 3d. each. Longmans.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND HANDBOOKS. No. 3, Latin and English Christianity. By the Rev. A. Fawkes. No. 6, Richard Hooker and his Teaching. By the Rev. R. H. Murray, Litt.D. No. 14, The Meaning of the Order for Holy Communion. By the Rev. J. F. Bethune-Baker, D.D., Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. J. A. Thompson and Co., Liverpool. 6d. each.

EVOLUTION AND THE SUPERNATURAL. By the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. *Sunday School Times* Company, Philadelphia. 25 cents.

Dr. White's pamphlet is an attempt to explain the Atonement in terms of the modern philosophy of punishment. His brief history of the various theories is well written: but he is obsessed by prejudice against "the accretions and interpretations of the centuries." "Much of St. Paul's phraseology is necessarily repugnant to our modern thought." But there is nothing infallible about the modern attitude towards religion. We do not like the sentence, "This doctrine of love has made Jesus incomparably the greatest of men." The author nowhere identifies Jesus with God.

The same tendency appears even more clearly in Dr. Rashdall's pamphlet. He draws a sharp distinction between "the two rival Traditional answers" to his question: the theory of the Church as "the aggregate

of individual disciples," and the theory of it as a kind of spiritual State, a great world-wide Society founded by Christ. He asserts that Christ founded not a world-wide society, but a band of brothers, which afterwards developed by itself into the historical world-wide society; and he rejects, as the products of a later age, the passages in St. Matthew where our Lord speaks of His Church. We cannot admit that this treatment of the Gospels is legitimate. We regard the Gospels, first, as a true picture, on the whole, of our Lord's life and teaching (otherwise Christianity is founded on a mere myth), but not necessarily accurate in every detail; secondly, as the record, inspired by the Holy Spirit, of God's supreme and final revelation to men. Even if the words attributed to our Lord were not actually spoken by Him, they are to be accepted as if they had been, because their teaching is what He, through the Holy Spirit, inspired the Apostles and their companions to proclaim to the world. Our religion is not based upon the words which, in the opinion of modern critics, can be proved to have been uttered by our Lord, nor upon the Gospels expurgated to make them fit modern ideas, but on the New Testament as a whole.

In this particular case the argument against the genuineness of the words attributed to our Lord is singularly weak. Christ, it appears, did not say "Tell it unto the Church," or, "On this rock I will build My Church," because "the term Ecclesia could have had no meaning for His original hearers." Did our Lord never say anything which the disciples failed to understand at the time, but came to understand later on? Besides, the disciples must have been quite familiar with the conception of the Ecclesia or Congregation of Israel, and with its representatives, the Jewish communities in different cities. Christ, indeed, did not found the Church. He found it already existing, and reconstituted it, substituting the twelve Apostles for the faithless priests and rulers.

Dr. Rashdall has much that is beautiful and true to say of the Church as "a great society of men and women who love one another." But his violent attack on "the absolute necessity of episcopacy and apostolical succession" shows an astonishing want of sense of proportion. The societies of Christians which have no bishops are societies formed in deliberate antagonism to the original Church, on principles which differ from hers not only as to episcopacy, but as to many other important matters. It would be interesting to know whether the "traditional" theory of the Church, as the aggregate of all individual Christians, has any history before the later Middle Ages. Certainly there is no trace of it in the New Testament.

Mr. Fawkes's attack on the religion of the Counter-Reformation contains much that is valuable and significant. Unfortunately he proves too much. "Between the Ultramontane Church and modern civilization there is an intrinsic opposition." But so there is between all forms of Christianity, Latin, Eastern, Anglican, or Protestant. Europe, as the Bishop of Ochrida has told us, has for 200 years been transferring Christianity from the centre to the circumference of its life. Mr. Fawkes does not perceive that what attracts many people to Rome is the fact that Rome is at any rate unquestionably loyal to the central truths summarized in the Apostles' Creed. It is useless to sneer at those who have "no haze on their horizon," if you are associated with persons who appear to be groping in a "London particular"! We agree that it would be disastrous if Ultramontanism, which, as Mr. Fawkes says, "represents the stereo-

typing, and consequent degeneration of a stage through which the Christian idea has passed," were to become the only representative of historic Christianity; and also that it is the only logical outcome of the Roman position. But Mr. Fawkes is attacking it with the wrong weapons. The Latin Christianity is like the little girl in the nursery rhyme:

> When she was good, she was very, very good,
> But when she was bad, she was horrid.

Mr. Fawkes sees a great deal that is horrid; but he would be in a stronger position if he would say, "Admitting the splendid fidelity of the Roman Communion to the Faith, the devotion of millions of her children, the heroism of her missionaries and her martyrs, and the magnificent efficiency of her practical system, I still maintain that her peculiar dogmas are untrue, that her autocratic government, with its claim to be infallible, is inconsistent with Christian liberty, and that reunion with her, on any other terms but complete submission and absorption, is a fantastic dream."

Dr. Murray will have done valuable service to the Church if his pamphlet leads its readers to the "Ecclesiastical Polity." The broad charity of Hooker, his defence of the true functions of law, and his appeal to sound reason, are greatly needed at the present day; but his style, magnificent as it is, requires, we fear, too much chewing for most people in this age of headlines and captions. Unfortunately Dr. Murray emphasizes the two features of Hooker's teaching which are obsolete—his Eucharistic doctrine, and his theory of Church and State. Hooker constantly appeals to the Fathers, as he was bound to do by the Canon of 1570, passed in his lifetime; but we now know that if he really denied the Real Objective Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice (and his denial is not so clear as to have prevented high authorities from defending his orthodoxy), he was setting himself against the whole of Christian teaching in every century previous to his own. In his view that Church and State are a single society under different aspects (to which Dr. Murray looks back with wistful longing), Hooker was a belated medieval. For that theory necessarily involves the refusal of civil rights to dissenters from the doctrine of the Church, which was universal in the age of Hooker, but which the modern world has rightly long since rejected. The State is, it is true, a Divine institution; but it is not identical with the Church; its nature and purpose are entirely different. Henry VIII. had no more right than the Pope to supremacy over the Church, in any but strictly temporal matters. Dr. Murray remarks significantly that Hooker, in defending the surplice, makes no mention of any other vestments. Of course not! It was with difficulty that the Puritan clergy were induced to wear the surplice; to insist on the chasuble, ordered though it was by the Ornaments Rubric, would have been madness. But the Eucharistic vestments have since acquired a significance which they did not possess in Hooker's time. They are to Anglo-Catholics what the Walls of Derry and Boyne Water are to Dr. Murray's compatriots in Ulster—the symbol of spiritual freedom; the badge of "No Surrender" to alien powers, be they Parliament or Privy Council, which claims to interfere with the doctrine and discipline of the Church of Christ.

Dr. Bethune-Baker's tract on Eucharistic doctrine does not bring us nearer to peace. He interprets the English Liturgy in the usual "Protestant" sense: he asserts that there is a rubric forbidding reservation (the rubric to which he presumably refers was written with a totally

different purpose), and he urges that, according to the Prayer-Book, "the only sacrifice offered in the Eucharist is that of ourselves." He defends the dislocation of the Canon, which he says has "done more than anything else to moralize and spiritualize the rite as a whole." In view of the dissatisfaction with that order, which has existed ever since the time of Bishop Overall, and which is now so widespread and so clamorous as to threaten the Church with anarchy, if something is not done to remedy the grievance, Dr. Bethune-Baker's plea for it is distinctly ill-timed.

Dr. Griffith Thomas's little book is of a different character from the others; it is an attack on the theory of evolution on the ground that it is contrary to Christianity. Its scientific arguments must be left for the biologists to deal with. Certainly Dr. Thomas is right in protesting against the application of the category of evolution to matters with which it has no concern; but when he says, "It is necessary to say quite plainly that if the Bible is true, Evolution cannot be true," and, again, "Evolution is opposed to the whole conception of Christianity as a Divine revelation," we seem to catch an echo of the spirit of those who condemned Galileo.

C. B. Moss.

The Indian Church Commentaries. 1 Corinthians, with Introduction and Notes by E. F. Brown, M.A., Oxford Mission to Calcutta. S.P.C.K. 6s.

This book is a model of what a popular commentary should be—simple, direct, practical, and yet making due use of modern critical scholarship for the elucidation of the text (*e.g.*, the writer illustrates the apostolic salutation from the papyri, and shows acquaintance with the researches of Deissmann, though it must be owned that references to recent German criticism are few and far between). The Introduction is a particularly vivid piece of writing, describing the moral transformation brought about in sinful Corinth by the preaching of the Gospel between the date of St. Paul's Epistle, A.D. 55, and that of the Epistle of Clement, *c.* A.D. 97. The commentary is full of local colour, and systematically applies St. Paul's religious and ethical principles to the conditions of modern India. The following is a typical passage: "He gave [the Corinthians] a new hope—for till St. Paul had come among them they had been without hope. And nothing, I think, so strikes a Christian coming among you here in India, as that the people of this country live without hope, without any certain expectation of anything better after death. . . . What comfort is it to the sorrowing mother as she looks on the still face of her dead boy, to be told that he will live again in the form of an animal, or in another human being? 'I shall not know him, he will not be my child, he will neither know nor love me,' is her heart-breaking cry. Or what comfort is it to be told, as Buddha told the weeping mother, that her sorrow was the human lot?"

The doctrine of the commentary is throughout orthodox and Catholic, and its Church tone unexceptionable. The difficult question of the resurrection of the body is particularly well handled: "The body is not merely the present transitory organization, but it is the essential form of our personality, and is destined, not for destruction like the material particles, but for resurrection with Christ; therefore it is *for* Christ, and Christ is *for* it, because His Incarnation took place in order that our bodies, as well as our souls, might have eternal life through His indwelling.

Already we see bodies being to some extent fashioned by the soul within them: most people show their characters, good or evil, on their faces as they grow older. The resurrection will complete that transformation, and each one's body will then be a perfect manifestation as well as a perfect instrument of spirit."

The writer is a temperate advocate of the monastic ideal, which he regards as specially suitable for India: "The traditions of India may point it out as the privilege of her Church to revive the examples of primitive asceticism, and to reconstruct under modern conditions those great monastic orders to which the Catholic Church, both in East and West, has owed so much of its power."

The treatment of the problem of the Brethren of the Lord is novel and interesting. Canon Brown rejects all the three current solutions (the Epiphanian, the Hieronymian, and the Helvidian); and argues that they were the sons of Clopas, the brother of Joseph, the foster-father of Jesus, and of his wife Mary (John xix. 25), whom, however, he does not, like Jerome, regard as the Virgin's sister. Our Lord's "Brethren," therefore, were His "cousins," but on the side of Joseph, not of Mary. He supposes that the brothers Joseph and Clopas and their families lived under the same roof, after the manner of "the undivided family" of the East. "It has always been the custom in the East, and is so to this day, for the sons when they marry, not to set up separate establishments of their own, but to bring their wives to the ancestral house of the family." "We who live in India know that cousins are *always* called brothers—they are never called anything else. No native of India, even though he talks English, ever thinks of calling his cousin anything but a brother." The present writer, who some years ago defended the Epiphanian theory at length in Hastings's D.C.G., now considers that Canon Brown's theory is worthy of at least serious attention.

If the present volume is anything like a fair specimen of Indian Christian literature, the future of Indian Christianity must be regarded as decidedly hopeful. We wish it a wide circulation in England as well as India.

CHARLES HARRIS.

JESUS AND THE GREEKS. By William Fairweather, D.D. T. and T. Clark. 12s.

The sub-title of this book, *Early Christianity in the Tideway of Hellenism*, gives a sufficient indication of its scope. The author's general conclusion seems to be that early Christianity stood like a rock fort, which the tides of Hellenism rend. There may have been moments when they threatened to obscure it from view, but they were unable to dislodge it from its position, nor did they produce any appreciable effects upon its inherent character. His "text," if we may so say, which appears on the title-page, is, of course, St. John xii. 20-21.

We are entirely in agreement with Dr. Fairweather's conclusion, and we regard the book as timely. There is a tendency in some circles to treat Christianity as if it were no more than a by-product of Hellenic civilization, coloured, perhaps, not altogether for the better, with an admixture of Jewish ideas. No reputable scholar is likely to entertain this view, but there is a not uncommon type of mind to which it proves attractive. It necessarily detracts from the unique importance of the Founder.

Dr. Fairweather sets out the contrary view with much learning and considerable skill, but we are disposed to think that his book might have been better arranged. It falls into three divisions: *The Diffusion of Hellenism* (pp. 1-157), *The Jewish Hellenist Philo of Alexandria* (pp. 161-216), and *Hellenism and Christianity* (pp. 219 to end).

We think that the first of these sections is overloaded. It contains nothing new to any scholar, and a much shorter sketch would have sufficed the general reader. In Section II. we think that he exaggerates the importance of Philo. Philo did not invent allegorical exegesis (it had been applied to Homer as well as to the Old Testament before his time), and we think that he is a representative of a tendency rather than the founder of a school. He could have been disposed of in fewer pages. The disproportionate length of Sections I. and II. has led to Section III., which is the most important, being unduly compressed. In places it might almost be called "slight." For this reason we fear that Dr. Fairweather's interesting book will not be as effective as we should like it to be.

R. H. Malden.

Problems of Belief. By F. C. S. Schiller, D.Sc. Hodder. 3s. 6d. net.
The Philosophy of Religion. By D. Miall Edwards, M.A. Hodder. 6s. net.

We welcome Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton's "Library of Philosophy and Religion," to which the above volumes belong. At a time like the present, when philosophical books can hardly find a market, and when the sale even of important theological works is slow and uncertain, it shows no little enterprise to plan such a philosophical series as this, at prices ranging from 3s. 6d. to 6s. Although one or two of the contributors are Churchmen, the general tone of the series is definitely Protestant and Nonconformist, the primary aim of the writers being obviously to encourage the study of philosophy among adherents of the Free Churches. With this aim we have every sympathy, but we cannot help wishing that there were just such another series edited and written by Churchmen. The revival of philosophy in the Church of England is one of the most urgent needs of the day, and we need not only technical treatises intended for specialists, but also popular treatments of the chief problems of philosophy, such as is provided in these volumes. Could not the S.P.C.K., or the English Church Union, which now numbers among its primary objects the encouragement of philosophy, do something to meet a very real need ?

Dr. Schiller's book, like everything he writes, simply sparkles with wit, humour, and paradox. It heads the series as an appropriate appetiser, stimulating the reader, like Oliver, "to ask for more." We do not, however, propose to discuss its contents, interesting as they are. Pragmatism, after a brief vogue, has for some time past been condemned by the almost unanimous judgment of English philosophers as superficial and inadequate. Dr. Schiller has practically no followers. Even in America Pragmatism has greatly declined in favour since the death of William James. The theory that truth is identical with utility, and that we make truth rather than apprehend it, is too much of a paradox to be acceptable to the plain man, and too complete a breach with the entire philosophic tradition to commend itself to the philosopher. In the religious sphere Pragmatism has proved itself the natural ally of the

more agnostic types of Modernism. It is the avowed basis of the religious systems of Loisy, Le Roy, and Murri. We would warn English sympathizers with this type of Christian teaching that its philosophic basis is most insecure.

Mr. Miall Edwards, who is professor of the philosophy of religion in a Welsh Congregational College, has written a book which, though less brilliant, is sounder and more useful than Dr. Schiller's. The first portion, which deals with anthropology and the historical development of religion, covers familiar ground, and contains little of outstanding interest. The last three chapters, however, contain a really valuable and well-balanced treatment of some of several of the most important present-day problems of religion. Mr. Miall earnestly defends the objectivity of human knowledge against all forms of subjectivism and phenomenalism. To the Christian and Neo-Christian contention that the human mind can know only "phenomena," not objective or ultimate reality, he makes the convincing reply that this theory postulates an unreal and incredible severance between the human mind and the objective universe, which, after all, "belong together" as one system. "Its essential defect," he writes, "is that it is based on the unconscious assumption that man is somehow alien in the very world that gave him birth, and in whose bosom he lives and moves and has his being; that he is doomed to look at the universe through the medium of forms and categories of thought, which are, so to speak, mental spectacles of foreign manufacture. Now this is really contrary to our whole post-Darwinian habit of thought, by which we regard man as "organic to the world," continuous with Nature though transcending it, one who was born, not in a vacuum, but from the womb of Mother Nature. . . . We must think, too, of the forms of his understanding, not as imported articles, but as products which are native to the soil."

While appreciative of Bergson's great contribution to modern philosophy (notably his insistence on the reality of free-will, and of the *creative* character of evolution), he challenges his depreciation of reason, and his attempt to set reason and instinct in antagonistic opposition: "There is no break between thought and intuition. To regard thought as a mere utilitarian instrument is a caricature."

His criticism of Pragmatism is severe, but not unjust. Neo-Realism is criticized with appreciation and sympathy, but with a keen eye to the many weak points of the system. His treatment of Hegel and Hegelianism, though brief, is judicious and discriminative, and (considering the small space available), remarkably comprehensive. We desire to commend this book to our readers; asking them, however, to remember that, when they have read it, they will hardly have touched the fringe of the most difficult and intricate of all subjects of enquiry. The disadvantage of publishing books—especially easy and popular books—on the philosophy of religion is that the subject thereby tends to become detached from philosophy proper, and the erroneous opinion arises that the fundamental problems of religion can be satisfactorily studied without any previous technical training in general philosophy (logic, metaphysics, ethics, psychology). It is really metaphysics which is "the philosophy of religion," and Aristotle was quite right in making it "theology." Metaphysics is the science of ultimate reality; and, of course, the most ultimate of all realities is God.

CHARLES HARRIS.

THE CLOUD OF UNKNOWING. The Epistle of Privy Counsel, and the Denis Hid Divinity. Edited by Dom Justin McCann, of Ampleforth Abbey. Burns Oates and Washbourne, "The Orchard Books." 5s.

INTRODUCTION TO THE DEVOUT LIFE. By Saint Frances de Sales, in a new translation by Allan Ross, priest of the London Oratory. The same series.

QUÆ DE BEATA MARIA VIRGINE. Passim Scripsit Thomas à Kempis, collegit et rite ordinavit Johannes Mercator, presbyter in partibus Hollandiæ. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 5s.

The devotional series known as "The Orchard Books" is deserving of high praise as a scholarly and, in the best sense, popular issue of spiritual reading in a convenient form. Of the three fourteenth-century works edited by Dom Justin McCann, the *Cloud of Unknowing* has already been printed by Fr. Collins in 1871, and by Miss Underhill, to whose work the present editor alludes more than once in high appreciation, in 1912. The authorship remains a problem, and Dom McCann, after glancing in his Introduction at existing theories, modestly refrains from adding to them, though it is evident he is following up fresh lines of research. The *Epistle of Privy Counsel* has only been printed once before, and then unsatisfactorily, while the Denis Hid Divinity—which may be rendered to those unfamiliar with it, the Mystical Theology of one assuming the authority of Dionysius the Areopagite—has never been printed before. The present editor has been well advised in all three cases slightly to modernize the diction. As a rule the vocabulary used by English mystical writers of the later Middle Age is a great hindrance to their assimilation by readers of to-day. The very title—*e.g.*, *Cloud of Unknowing*—requires the page (xxvi) which the Introduction here devotes to it, to enable the reader to recognize a condition of soul with which every serious man and woman is familiar, a spiritual agnosticism which the experience of the medieval mystic illuminates and dispels. The edition is further enriched with the *Commentary* written by Fr. Baker in 1629, a work which appears here for the first time in full.

Of English translations of the *Vie Dévote* since that by John Yaworth, five years after the appearance of the work in France, there have been many, all alike imperfect in their rendering, and some so abounding in glosses that it is impossible without critical acumen to distinguish between the author and his editors. In some cases we have had translation without any meaning, his or other. The fact is the Saint's meaning is not always easy to catch, and gratitude is owing to Fr. Ross for this correct rendering, given us in a prose not unworthy of the great Catholic classic. A brief Introduction serves to acquaint those who need it with the simple story of de Sales' life, and of the saintly women, de Chantal and de Charmoisy, who chiefly, among the many who submitted themselves to his direction, gave rise to the origin of this book. All this is told admirably, and sends the reader forward to the work itself with interest and hope for his own soul. We shall be surprised if this rendering does not take its place as the *editio princeps* of the *Vie Dévote* in English.

From the same publishers we receive a collection of meditations on the Blessed Virgin Mary in the original Latin gathered by a Dutch priest, Fr. J. Mercator, from the *Opera omnia* of à Kempis published by the Jesuit Sommalius in Antwerp in 1607. Quaint Latin hymns of simple rhythm are interspersed, reminding us of the *Oratio de elevatione mentis*

in Deum, but they can scarcely be said to enrich our anthology of ecclesiastical verse, and certainly cannot be set beside Adam of St. Victor or Thomas of Celano. A fair specimen is afforded by the stanza:

> O qualis, quanta laetitia
> resonat in cælesti patria
> ubi Jesus gaudet cum Maria
> laeta vultu, dulci melodia.

But the bulk of the volume is prose, and the prose marks, we feel, a disappointing elevation from that of the *Imitatio*. The object of the collection, we are told in the *præfatio*, is "dein vindicare cultum beatæ Mariæ virginis auctoritate Thomae a Kempis." As à Kempis does not possess the status of saint or doctor, it is a little difficult to understand in what sense his "authority" can be invoked, except as an example of current medieval thought, and in this sense the close association of our Lord with His Mother throughout these excerpts is very significant.

T. J. HARDY.

THE VOCABULARY OF THE GREEK TESTAMENT. Illustrated from the Papyri and other non-literary sources. By George Milligan, D.D. Part V. *μαγεύω* to *ὀψώνιον*. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

Professor Milligan is now four-fifths of the way through his noble undertaking, begun in 1914 with the appearance of Part I. in collaboration with Professor Moulton. A close study of the present volume at first sight seems disappointing. In any such work the law of diminishing returns asserts itself. The new point of view, revealed by Deissmann's early works, Moulton's Grammar, and Dr. Milligan's own Commentary on the Thessalonians and Selections from the Papyri, won an instantaneous victory. The discovery that the Greek of the New Testament was, with a few obvious exceptions, the common non-literary language of the day, was a delightful and wholly satisfying simplification of problems. Thrills are no longer to be expected, only the patient adding of stone to stone. For this very reason we are the more grateful to Dr. Milligan for his labours, and to the publishers for undertaking these probably unremunerative volumes. When completed, the Vocabulary will be a possession to be treasured for at least fifty years. The purchaser need have no fear that his book will soon become obsolete. It is unlikely that future discoveries in this field of learning will materially affect the results here recorded. If they do, then the fortunate owner can enter them in the very ample margins so thoughtfully provided.

A few specimens of the treasures to be found may be welcome. An Emperor says to the condemned Appianus in the Oxyrhyncus Papyri: "We are accustomed to bring to their senses those who are mad or beside themselves," and receives the answer: "I am neither mad nor beside myself" (*νὴ τὴν σὴν τύχην οὔτε μαίνομαι οὔτε ἀπονενόημαι*; *cf.* Acts xxvi. 24 *f.*). The papyri bear out Kennedy's contention that *μορφή* ("form") has a non-technical meaning, so that it cannot be pressed in Phil. ii. 6. *οἶκος* is shown to be an *insula*, or set of rooms, "flat," in contrast with *οἰκία*, the whole house. The Temple in the N.T. is always *οἶκος*, but "in My Father's house (*οἰκίᾳ*) are many mansions." *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* in Matt. xxviii. 19 in the light of papyri usage means "into the possession of the Father," etc. The A.V. of Matt. xxvi. 50, "Friend, wherefore art thou come?" is perhaps preferable to the R.V. "Do that for which thou art come" (*ἑταῖρε, ἐφ' ὃ πάρει*), *τίς* and *ὅς* becoming interchangeable in the late Koine.

W. K. L. CLARKE.

THE NATURE OF A CATHEDRAL. By F. S. M. Bennett. Mowbrays. 2s.

Another Dean is extremely grateful for the opportunity of saying how warmly he welcomes the Dean of Chester's little book. In a wonderful way he has managed to compress all his enthusiasms and all his successes —both of which we all know—into a small space. He shows that not only does he believe in throwing open cathedrals without any fee (in which I most cordially agree), but that he has reasoned plans for the reform of their constitutions (in which also I find myself in some respects very much of his mind). The great thing is to make people at home in their cathedrals as places of prayer, not of sightseeing; but there must be sightseeing, too. If people are to learn the wonderful religious lessons of the medieval builders, they must also be places of quiet, not of noise and hustle. Of course; there are points where not all will agree with him, and points which we need much more space to explain, and, of course, he must not think that every city and every cathedral are like Chester, or could be treated in the same way, for most certainly they are not and could not. One cannot but be very sorry for him, that he finds it so much more hard to keep his attention at choral mattins than at choral evensong, but that is a personal misfortune; and when he wants to abolish the former, one must leave him to the tender mercies of the great English musicians, past and present, and beg him to read the Church Music Society's admirable paper on the Choral Foundations of the Church of England. Experts will doubtless tell him that when he talks of maintaining the English Use, he merely means the European Late Medieval Use. And some may contend that when he thinks a sitting posture for religious meditation the best, the general use is in favour of kneeling, and when he thinks that misericords were intended for people to sit on, the answer is, "Let him try." When we are thinking of the ancient and surviving use of the English Church, not of dissenting bodies, we must remember that it is undoubtedly for all to sing the Psalms standing. His extracts from E. A. Freeman's essay are most useful. The book they come from should be read by the Church Assembly Commission now sitting. As to the closing of cathedral churches at certain hours, it certainly has nothing to do with the notion that cathedrals are museums, and it is practically universal all over Europe, and that for severely practical reasons. Such are general and rather trivial criticisms. A personal one of my own is that I cannot think that a dean should regard his cathedral as his "principal sphere of work": it should be his only one. What should we say of a parish priest who regarded his parish as only his principal sphere? But I am saying all these little things in a sort of protest, first because I am so cordially and wholeheartedly delighted with the little book as a whole. What his main points for reform are I have not said, just because I want everyone to read the book and find out. But one omission I do consider most important. He does not refer to the absolute and pressing need for promoting the greater efficiency of the Cathedral Chapters regarded as centres of learning. I am afraid that if we reduce the active canons to two, and give them definite duties, we shall harm, not help, the cause of religious learning. For the rest I thank the Dean of Chester. When he is unkind to other cathedrals, they must forgive him. But the one thing we must not do, if we are to remain Englishmen and follow an English Use, is to make all cathedral constitutions in one cast-iron mould.

W. H. HUTTON.

BOOK NOTES

The Cambridge Carol Book. Edited by Charles Wood and George Ratcliffe Woodward. S.P.C.K. Words 3d. Music Edition 2s. 6d. and 3s. 6d. Thirty-four carols for Christmas, 4 for Holy Week, 7 for Eastertide, and 8 for various occasions are provided in this very welcome book. The words of 10 of these are by miscellaneous writers, 15 are translations or adaptations made by Dr. Woodward, and 28 are the original and excellent work of the same writer. His attempt to recapture the simplicity and quaint phrasing of the old carols is markedly successful, and the wedding of words and tunes is for the most part very happy. Why, in the title and first line of No. XII. does *lain* appear for *laid? Matins and Evensong.* By Clement F. Rogers. Faith Press. 3s. Professor Rogers, greatly valuing our unique possession of a popular choir office suitable also for private use, does not despair of persuading Churchmen to attend the daily services. "It took the Church some three hundred years to evolve her daily services, and we cannot expect to revive them in as many days." Explaining the services by telling the history of their growth, with full references as a guide to further reading, he recommends us to encourage people to use parts of them privately, and then to endeavour to gather them to church day by day for corporate worship. Those who know Mr. Rogers's books will be prepared to find much sound application of psychology and much practical wisdom concerning the equipment of churches and the ordering of the services. *The Logia in Ancient and Recent Literature.* By John Donovan, S.J. Heffer. 2s. The author provides abundant illustrations of the use of the term *Logia* from the third century B.C. to the tenth century A.D., in support of his contention that the Logia of St. Matthew mentioned by Papias "was nothing else but Matthew's Gospel." *Problems of Church Unity.* By Walter Lowrie. Longmans. 9s. In a book of more than 300 pages of rather small type marred by an unpardonable number of misprints, the Rector of the American Church in Rome treats of the problem of Church unity with knowledge and with great charity. Conceiving the Church as a pyramid, he contends that it is to be built downwards from the apex, which is prayer—common prayer. "Generally people seem more inclined to pray for unity than to seek union in prayer." But this, according to the writer, must come first. "By the 'top' I mean the simple uniting fact of meeting in the presence of God, and the base of the pyramid consists of all the remoter implications of this fact in the development of polity, theology, institutions of charity, and worship—which are the four describing lines of the pyramid, long drawn out in proportion as the base recedes and the area is enlarged." In spite of the careless proof-reading the book deserves to be carefully pondered as an illuminating statement of the views of one who looks for unity through the growth of spiritual fellowship without the requirement of the initial acceptance of any prepared scheme, and yet offers many practical suggestions based on a true appreciation of the necessity of ultimate growth into the Catholic standards of faith, order, and practice.

O.H.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER